

282067

JPRS-TAC-86-074

12 SEPTEMBER 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990422 103

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8
92
A05

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

12 SEPTEMBER 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

- Dutch Scientist Calls Laser Weapons Unsuitable for SDI
(Bart Stam; Rijswijk PT/AKTUEEL, 7 May 86)..... 1

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

- Soviet General on Significance of Strategic Parity
(Yu. Lebedev; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 7, Jul 86)... 3

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

- TASS Cites U.S. Expert Working Near Soviet Nuclear Test Site
(Moscow TASS, 22 Aug 86)..... 9

- Moscow TV Talk Show on Test Ban Issue
(Nikolay Agayants, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service,
17 Aug 86)..... 10

- TASS Cites Swedish CDE Delegate on Test Ban Verification
(Moscow TASS, 5 Aug 86)..... 15

- TASS Cites Seismologists' Report to CD
(Moscow TASS, 14 Aug 86)..... 16

- USSR: Reports on Delhi Six Message to Reagan
(Moscow TASS, various dates; Moscow PRAVDA, 12 Aug 86)..... 17

- Consultations Urged 17
PRAVDA Commentary, by Veniamin Shurygin 17

U.S., Soviet Stances Contrasted, by Vladimir Chernyshev	18
Reagan Response Hit, by Valeriy Fesenko	20
TASS: Delhi Six Offer Help in Verifying Test Ban (Moscow TASS, 23 Aug 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 24 Aug 86).....	21
Text of Message	22
Gorbachev Responds, by M.S. Gorbachev	22
USSR: Reports on Implementing South Pacific NFZ Accord (Various sources, various dates).....	25
Protocols Approved	25
U.S. 'Hostility', by Vasiliy Kharkov	25
Broadcast to Japan, by Afonin	27
Moscow Reports Plans for Meeting of Korean NFZ (Moscow International Service, 27 Aug 86).....	29
USSR: Latvian Official Discusses Nordic NFZ Issue (Nikolay Neyland Interview; Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET, 26 Jul 86).....	31
USSR: Japanese Protest Visit by Tomahawk-Armed 'New Jersey' (S. Agafonov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 23 Aug 86).....	34
PRAVDA Views 'Excommunication' of New Zealand (Aleksey Ivkin; Moscow PRAVDA, 13 Aug 86).....	37
Briefs	
Rally Urges Test Ban	38
RELATED ISSUES	
PRAVDA Bemoans U.S. Leaders' 'Level of Political Thinking' (G. Vasilyev; Moscow PRAVDA, 26 Aug 86).....	39
USSR's Petrovskiy on Security in Modern Conditions (V. Petrovskiy; Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, No 7, Jul 86).....	43
CPSU Politburo Discusses Asian Security Issues (Moscow Domestic Service, 15 Aug 86).....	49
PRAVDA Weekly Review: Asian Security, South Pacific NFZ (Vladimir Mikhaylov; Moscow PRAVDA, 17 Aug 86).....	51
Moscow Talk Show: NST, SDI, Test Ban, Asian Security, Korean NFZ (Konstantin Patsyuk, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 15 Aug 86).....	54

Moscow Press Briefing: Test Ban, SALT, SDI, CW (Gennadiy Gerasimov, et al.; Moscow Television Service, 27 Aug 86).....	58
USSR: More on Moscow World Scientists' Forum (Various sources, various dates).....	67
Address by WFSW President	67
22 July Session	67
Documents Adopted; Forum Ends, by I. Belov, M. Demichev	69
CPSU's Zimyanin Addresses Soviet Peace Commission (Moscow TASS, 22 Aug 86).....	72
Soviet General Shabanov Writes on Arms Policies (V. Shabanov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 15 Aug 86).....	74
USSR's Chazov Writes on Physicians' Movement (Ye. Chazov; Moscow PRAVDA, 16 Aug 86).....	80
TASS Cites Gandhi Statement on Disarmament (Moscow TASS, 8 Aug 86).....	84
Soviet Movie on Nuclear War Aftermath (Yevg. Yeviusenko; Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 26 Jul 86)...	86
Briefs	
U.S.-Soviet Consultations	87

/6539

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

DUTCH SCIENTIST CALLS LASER WEAPONS UNSUITABLE FOR SDI

Rijswijk PT/AKTUEEL in Dutch 7 May 86 p 3

[Article by Bart Stam: "Laser Weapons Inefficient for Use in SDI"]

[Text] "We conclude that laser weapons at present and in the future are not suitable for destroying missiles at distances of several thousand kilometers." With this statement, U.S. President Reagan's general concept of a Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] was definitely pronounced dead and buried.

This is the clear message of Dr Bart van der Sijde, who is connected with the technical science working group at TH [Technical Institute] Eindhoven. Van der Sijde gave a talk about laser weapons on behalf of this working group during the congress "Peace through Star Wars?" held in the lecture hall of the Utrecht fairgrounds.

Since 23 March 1983, the day on which Reagan made his Star Wars plans known to the world, van der Sijde and his colleague and friend Dr Willem de Ruiter have closely followed American space shield plans. In the book "De Nucleaire Erfenis" [The Nuclear Heritage] (see PT/AKTUEEL No 2, 8 January 1986), which was published last year, both authors devoted a separate chapter to particle and laser weapons in SDI, the euphemism for "Star Wars." As is known, Reagan has set aside almost 1 billion dollars in the 1986 Defense Budget for the development of these systems.

According to Van der Sijde, the Pentagon is focusing 80 percent of its attention and interest on high energy lasers, which together with kinetic energy weapons are to form the basis for the defense shield for realizing SDI. Kinetic energy weapons are small projectiles, missiles and bullets.

Some experimental tests have been made using these kinetic weapons, and they have been found to work. Such was the case when, during the so-called "Homing Overlay Experiment" in June 1984, a rocket of the Minute Man variety was launched and shot down with a guided missile. The next step that made news was the destruction of an unused satellite not in use in September 1985 by an ASAT rocket, a small anti-satellite weapon.

Laser Weapons

Many of the laser weapons are still in an embryonic state, according to Van der Sijde. "The general application of laser weapons has not improved over the past 3 years, despite some results which looked promising at first glance," said Van der Sijde. That a deuterium-fluoride (DF) laser succeeded in blowing up the third stage of a Titan rocket might look like a small success to Reagan and company, but it is humbug to the Eindhoven scientist. "The DF laser, because of its 3.8 micrometer wavelength and allied mirror-image axes and energies, is in fact unsuitable as a space weapon." Van der Sijde points out that the Titan rocket was hit while on the ground. "The blowing up of the Titan rocket has sometimes mockingly been compared with catching a rabbit in a rabbit cage, while in essence catching a hare in an open field is what it is all about."

Also the X-ray lasers, which make up the third generation in the family of nuclear weapons, following the splice-and-fusion bombs, would be unsuitable for the Strategic Defense Initiative, according to Van der Sijde. "Because the scientists at Lawrence Livermore and their colleagues at Los Alamos have differing scientific opinions about the value of measurements and X-ray beaming, there is great doubt about whether or not the X-ray laser can work. Even if the X-ray laser can deliver a megajoule of laser energy, shortcomings such as the small output (the ratio between subtracted and added energies), and the limited beam quality caused by the lack of guidance mirrors, are very much in evidence.

Optimistic predictions from the United States about FEL (free electron lasers) are unfounded, according to Van der Sijde: "The free electron laser, which is based on an unconventional laser action in an electron beam has the advantage that the wave length can be chosen freely within practical ranges, and thus atmospheric scattering and absorption can be avoided in principle, and mirror-image axes can be kept within limits." Nevertheless, the shortcomings of this type are also dominant. With an energy capacity of less than 1 joule, the free electron laser is still in its infant years. "At present the FEL can't even light a cigarette," says Van der Sijde. Only at wave lengths between 0.5 and 1 micrometer, electron energy between 60 and 100 megavolts, and power strengths of more than 1 mega ampere will the free electron laser be of some practical use to SDI. But Van der Sijde predicts that the problems involved in upgrading FEL capacity to that level are "insoluble."

13092/12379
CSO: 5200/2718

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

SOVIET GENERAL ON SIGNIFICANCE OF STRATEGIC PARITY

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 7, Jul 86 pp 23-28

[Article by Major-General Yu. Lebedev]

[Text]

The documents of the 27th CPSU Congress note the increased role of this country and of the entire socialist community as a potent factor in fighting against aggression and war, for peace, democracy and social progress. The forum of the Soviet Communists has stressed that the CPSU will continue to make every effort to ensure that the Soviet Armed Forces be maintained at a level precluding military supremacy of the forces of imperialism. As is noted in the new edition of the CPSU Programme, the establishment of the military and strategic parity between the USSR and the USA, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO) and NATO has become a historic achievement of socialism. The established balance of forces has dashed the hopes of the aggressive quarters of imperialism, primarily of the United States, that they might win a world nuclear war.

The military and strategic parity has not been achieved in one day but it has required gigantic efforts of the entire Soviet people, major strides forward in the economic, scientific and technological development of the USSR, and constant attention paid by the Party and the government to securing the nation's defence potential, building the Soviet Armed Forces and enhancing their combat readiness.

The core of the military and strategic parity is the rough balance in the Soviet and US strategic armaments as well as in medium-range nuclear systems and conventional arms of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO. It stands to reason that the military equilibrium does not imply a mathematical identity in the quantitative and structural aspects of the opposing armed forces. Each of them is known for its own historically established priorities and peculiarities. Therefore, the parity can be objectively defined only if the totality of all specific disproportions in armaments is evaluated, taking into account the historically shaped structure of the military forces and some other factors determining the strategic situation. In other words, in dealing with the issue one should be guided by the principle of equality and equal security.

It should be stressed at once that the Soviet Union believes that a rough parity is sufficient for defensive needs. It has never set the goal of upsetting the existing equilibrium and gaining military superiority over the other side. Moreover, the Soviet Union holds the view that the maintenance of the military and strategic parity is exactly what is needed to ensure implementation of the principle of equality and equal security and lays groundwork for preserving and strengthening peace, for everything which, taken en masse, is termed international stability.

The United States holds a different position. The US ruling quarters have set themselves a task of tipping in their favour, whatever the cost, the alignment of forces in the world scene and securing military supremacy of the USA over the USSR and of NATO over the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. The escalation of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, is viewed as the most essential means for scuttling the military and strategic balance. Reliance on force in tackling international issues, which has been elevated by Washington to the level of state policy, predetermines the nature and thrust of US war preparations.

In building up its strategic forces and making them capable of launching the first nuclear strike, the United States deployed in the 1970s 550 new Minuteman 3 ICBMs tipped with three warheads each, developed Trident 1 SLBMs, and equipped 31 submarines with Poseidon missiles, each of them having 10 to 14 warheads. Strategic bombers have been armed with SRAM attack missiles (up to 20 missiles per airplane). By adding almost three nuclear warheads daily, the USA has all but doubled its nuclear potential over the past decade, increasing it to 10,000 pieces. It has been the first to equip its missiles with multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles and to initiate the development of a new type of strategic arms, i.e. long-range air-, ground- and sea-based cruise missiles. It is also symbolic that the improvement of nuclear systems has pursued the goal of increasing their accuracy and the yield of their warheads. The US strategic forces communications and control system has undergone modernisation.

Along with building up its strategic nuclear potential, Washington has attached considerable importance in its military planning to encircling the Soviet Union with military bases. US forward-based nuclear systems have been fielded in Western Europe.

Under pressure by the United States, the North Atlantic bloc as a whole has also amplified its nuclear arsenal in Western Europe. The hundreds of US nuclear-capable aircraft have been supplemented with American submarines equipped with Polaris SLBMs to the total of 400 warheads. Aircraft carriers with nuclear-capable airplanes aboard have begun to ply sea waters in areas adjacent to the European continent. Several West European allies of the USA in NATO have begun to receive nuclear missile systems. In December 1979, NATO took a decision to deploy in Western Europe qualitatively new medium-range ballistic missiles, Pershing 2s, and land-based cruise missiles. While moving its nuclear arms nearer to the USSR borders, the USA has in fact attempted, in circumvention of the SALT 2 Treaty, to acquire an additional strategic potential.

The Soviet Union has been forced to respond to the growing military threat by strengthening its own defence capabilities. Pooling their efforts, the USSR and other socialist countries have demonstrated their ability to parry the inroads of any aggressor. Let us recall that the measures taken by the CPSU and the Soviet government permitted back in the early 1970s to do away with US preponderance in strategic armaments. Washington has had formally to acknowledge the existence of a balance in strategic nuclear forces: in February 1971 the then US President said that at that time neither the United States nor the Soviet Union had a clear-cut nuclear edge. Over almost seven years the established parity was checked and rechecked in the course of the Soviet-American SALT 2 negotiations and was formally recorded in 1979 during the signing of that Treaty. The Soviet Union has since strictly respected the conditions of that document and never increased the levels of strategic arms. It has 2,504 nuclear delivery units while the USA possesses a slightly lower number, i. e. 2,215 units.

As to land- and sea-based ballistic missiles, even according to American data the two sides have approximately 7,500 warheads of them each. In terms of the aggregate numbers of warheads, the United States still maintains an edge because of heavy bombers armed with long-range cruise missiles, SRAM missiles and nuclear bombs. On the whole, there

exists a rough parity of forces, which cannot be denied even by the USA. In a report to Congress concerning the military situation of the United States in 1986, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have noted that at present there exists a rough nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union.

As to the equilibrium in the nuclear forces between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, it should include, apart from strategic arms, medium-range systems and other respective nuclear weapons in Europe. The medium-range nuclear arms of the USA (forward-based) pose a direct strategic threat to the Soviet Union because they are capable of reaching its territory. At the same time, Soviet medium-range nuclear systems cannot hit the US territory. Moreover, there are British and French nuclear arms stationed in Europe.

In a bid to counterbalance NATO nuclear forces in Europe, the Soviet Union has deployed in its European part, in addition to aircraft systems, firstly SS-4 and SS-5 medium-range missiles and subsequently updated SS-20 missiles of the same category as a substitution for the former. In carrying out such a replacement, i. e. modernising its nuclear missile systems in the European part of the country and installing one new missile instead of one or two old ones, the USSR has not upset the balance of forces in that region in its favour.

At present, the USA has fielded 300 medium-range missiles in Western Europe; taking into account the British and French systems, there are, all in all, 478 such missiles. The USSR has 243 SS-20s in the European zone, with the number of warheads on them not greater than on the NATO missiles. Taking into account the aviation of the two sides, the ratio of nuclear warheads is approximately 3,000 to 2,000 in NATO's favour. Notwithstanding some differences in the mixup of the respective nuclear armaments and the corresponding measures taken by the USSR, there is every ground to speak about a rough balance in those weapons as well.

It is more difficult to determine a balance of forces in conventional armaments between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO. The West often uses that fact to its advantage while giving reality-distorting data. This is done in various ways, namely by providing higher-than-actual figures regarding the Warsaw Treaty Organisation armed forces or lower-than-actual figures for NATO troops, disregarding their respective reserve formations or prestored arms, and discounting the armies of Spain and France. Oftentimes, only armaments whose comparison would be to NATO's benefit are taken out of the overall mixup of weapons. Yet, even the Pentagon-published booklet *Soviet Military Power* admits that the manpower strength of NATO forces is 5.6 million while that of the Warsaw Treaty is only 4.9 million. While enjoying a 94 to 78 edge in combat-ready divisions, an advantage in antitank weapons and a roughly equal number of artillery pieces and tanks, NATO is slightly behind the Warsaw Treaty in the number of tactical aircraft. As to the naval forces, the advantage of NATO in major warships (aircraft carriers, aircraft-carrying ships, battleships, etc.) is offset by a bigger number of the Warsaw Treaty's submarines and smaller surface vessels. All in all, there is a rough balance of forces in conventional weapons as well. In this regard, a report published by the London Institute for Strategic Studies in 1986 says that neither of the sides (NATO or the Warsaw Treaty Organisation) possesses a sufficient aggregate conventional might to assure a victory.

Thus, the military and strategic parity between the USSR and the USA and between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO objectively does exist. The Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty countries proceed from the belief that the rough parity in military forces is sufficient to

meet the needs of defence. All their actions in the military field are taken as reciprocal steps in the interests of ensuring their defence capabilities. As has been stated by Mikhail Gorbachev at the 27th CPSU Congress, "naturally, like any other country, we attach considerable importance to the security of our frontiers, on land and at sea".

The United States and NATO countries pursue a diametrically opposite policy, having set their sights on tipping the alignment of forces on the world scene in their favour. It is through their fault that the situation in the early half of the 1980s has become particularly complex and explosive. The fact that it is precisely Washington that has initiated the arms race has been confirmed by the US President who said on May 22, 1984, that the Russians would not be able to rival with the USA and would not stand a competition in the arms buildup. Back in 1981, the White House declared its "strategic programme of America's rearmament" which provided for the development of new types of ICBMs such as MX and Midgetman, a Trident 2 ballistic missile for submarines, long-range cruise missiles of all basing modes (air-, sea-, and ground-based), and new strategic bombers B-1B and Stealth. Many of those armaments will shortly be added to the US arms inventory. The US continues its medium-range nuclear missile deployments in Europe and improves conventional arms which approach nuclear weapons in terms of their destructive potential. Nevertheless, none of those systems will strengthen American security or give any advantage to the USA.

The realities of today are such that the economic, scientific, technological and other capabilities of industrialised states do not permit any single country or a group of states to count on gaining military superiority. It is not fortuitous that the US nuclear policy, i. e. the position-of-strength policy, has now ended up in a deadlock. But the main thing is probably that because of the inevitability of a nuclear retaliatory strike all Washington's hopes of winning a nuclear war also become pointless. Under those conditions, the USA and some of its NATO allies, unwilling to comprehend the realities of the nuclear and space age, attempt to find a way out of the "nuclear impasse" through outer space. The masters of the White House are fooling themselves with a belief that through "star wars" they would allegedly be able to rush ahead militarily and to dictate their will to the Soviet Union. Yet, Washington's exertions are to no avail. Reliance on outer space and on space weapons based on new physical principles is utterly groundless. The Soviet Union possesses necessary material and intellectual capabilities to foil US attempts at acquiring military supremacy. The military and strategic parity has been and continues to be an objective factor of containment.

At the same time, the rapid pace of the arms race and the improvement of weapon systems can ultimately result in a situation in which the level of military parity per se would become perilously dangerous for stabilising the strategic situation and maintaining peace. The man overpowered by computers and automations can lose control over weaponry. A nuclear chaos can be triggered by an error or a technical malfunction in electronic equipment.

The Soviet Union is against such a turn of development. It comes out in favour of the existing parity in the military domain becoming a line which would mark the beginning of the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The central idea permeating the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress is that, in the first place, it is essential to considerably reduce the level of military confrontation and to achieve equal security at the lowest possible level of strategic balance which should totally exclude nuclear arms and other types of mass-destruction weapons.

The nuclear and space age explodes the habitual notion of security. Today, security can only be mutual or, taking humanity as a whole, universal. Given the huge piles of the accumulated weapons of mass destruction, it cannot and must not be built on the military force or a threat of using such force. This means that neither a nuclear war itself nor preparations for it, i. e. the arms race, can bring political benefits to anyone. Today, security of every state is increasingly dependent on how seriously it takes into account and respects security of its opponents. This idea has been expressed in very clear terms by Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement on the results of the Soviet-US summit in Geneva: "We would not want, for instance, a change in the strategic balance in our favour. We would not want that because such a situation will heighten suspicion on the other side and also increase the instability of the overall situation."

The Soviet Union is strongly opposed to a test of strength in developing new types and systems of weapons. As long as there is the balance of forces and outer space is free of weapons, it is necessary to work towards a joint understanding as regards a minimum level of armaments of each side that could be considered sufficient in terms of its defensive needs. Despite the existing asymmetry in the armed forces structure of the two sides, the Soviet Union has believed that there is no type of weapons which could not be reduced provided there is a mutual approach and a goodwill on the part of the negotiating partners. Naturally, such decisions should be worked out at the negotiating table, proceeding from the principle of equality and equal security.

Treating the destinies of humankind with a high sense of responsibility, the Soviet Union has advanced large-scale and extremely important initiatives aimed at lowering the level of the existing military balance both in the nuclear field and in conventional arms and armed forces.

The basis of those initiatives is provided by the programme of eliminating nuclear weapons on Earth by the year 2000. Through the three stages which will take, all in all, 15 years, it is scheduled to carry out a reduction of nuclear weapons, balanced in terms of their volume and categories, all the way down to their complete elimination. The realism of the programme lies in the fact that it is constructive and does not impinge on the security interests of either side. It provides for the nuclear weapons reductions to be done in a manner that would ensure an approximate balance of forces from the first to the last phase.

The first phase of the programme is a convincing example thereof. Given an agreement on banning space-strike arms, it is proposed that only Soviet and US armaments be reduced at that stage. The nuclear systems capable of reaching each other's territory would be cut by 50 per cent and Europe would thus be freed of both Soviet and US medium-range nuclear missiles. As to the issue of medium-range missiles in the European zone, the Soviet Union is prepared to solve it without directly linking it with strategic and space arms. In other words, an independent decision could be arrived at here in the near future.

The major reduction in both American and Soviet nuclear weapons at the first stage makes it legitimate and fair to raise the issue of the other European nuclear powers renouncing quantitative buildup of their respective arsenals while the USA would refrain from supplying its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries.

This is how the lowering of the level of the existing military and strategic parity could begin. Objective possibilities for that do exist. What is needed is for the USA to show a political will and readiness to translate into practice the agreements reached during the Geneva summit. The fact that a nuclear war is unwinnable, renunciation of attempts to gain an

edge over the other side, acceleration of the talks on nuclear and space arms as well as of other negotiations affecting security and disarmament issues have all been embodied in the Soviet proposals. They have found their succinct reflection in the idea of creating a comprehensive system of international security encompassing all spheres of activities of the world community. The fundamental principles of such a system have been set forth in the materials of the 27th CPSU Congress. They can become a point of departure for a fruitful dialogue between leaders of the countries of the world community. Such a dialogue is particularly important between the five nuclear powers.

Naturally, as long as the arms race continues and the threat of nuclear war is not ruled out, the military and strategic parity between the USA, the Warsaw Treaty and NATO remains a military and political factor of containment. For the threat of nuclear war to be erased for good from the face of the Earth it is essential that both nuclear and other types of mass-destruction weapons be taken out of circulation. The military potentials should be restricted to the limits of what is reasonably sufficient. Today, those limits are contingent on the attitudes and actions of the USA and its bloc partners. This cannot be disregarded by the Soviet Union, which will exert every effort to ensure that the country's defence capabilities be maintained at a level ruling out military superiority of the forces of imperialism. This has been particularly stressed by the 27th CPSU Congress.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English Translation copyright; Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 5200/1526

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS CITES U.S. EXPERT WORKING NEAR SOVIET NUCLEAR TEST SITE

LD221132 Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT 22 Aug 86

[Text] Alma Ata, 22 Aug (TASS)--David Carrell, a technical expert in seismic instruments and staffer of California State University in San Diego, U.S., told TASS that the Soviet leadership has made an important step toward peace by extending anew the moratorium on nuclear blasts. He is now staying near a Soviet test site in Kazakhstan to take part in the joint Soviet-U.S. experiment on monitoring nuclear test ban compliance.

Carrell said that they failed to detect a single nuclear explosion in the USSR during the entire duration of the experiment, although their instruments recorded wave lapping, wind breath and the echo of far away earthquakes.

He said there was full mutual understanding between Soviet and U.S. scientists in their joint work. It is desirable that politicians of our countries achieve the same mutual understanding.

The instruments accurately recorded the five U.S. nuclear blasts carried out at Nevada during the period of the joint work of Soviet and U.S. scientists in Kazakhstan. These facts alone are enough to convince skeptics that there does exist absolute possibility to detect tests of any yield wherever they are held.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW TV TALK SHOW ON TEST BAN ISSUE

LD171657 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 17 Aug 86

[Weekly "International Observers Round Table" program presented by Nikolay Agayants with Gennadiy Shishkin, first deputy director of TASS, and Viktor Levin, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator]

[Excerpts] [Agayants] Hello, comrades! This week has passed in an atmosphere of a further buildup in the peace advance by the socialist countries which, in various situations and at various levels, have been returning again and again to problems of safeguarding peace and security in the world, curbing the mind-bending arms race on earth and preventing it from being spread into outer space. As you will recall, on 12 August the acting permanent UN representative of the Hungarian People's Republic sent the UN secretary-general a letter from the foreign ministers of the Belorussian SSR, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Mongolia, the GDR, Romania, the USSR, the Ukraine SSR and Czechoslovakia suggesting that the question of setting up an all-embracing international security system be included on the agenda of the 41st UN General Assembly Session.

[Levin] That idea, as you know, comrades, was put forward in one of the speeches by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and it was further developed at a meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee. The fact that the socialist countries represented at the United Nations are now jointly putting this proposal forward for examination at the next General Assembly session clearly reflects the coordinated nature of the socialist countries' foreign policy course aimed at solving the fundamental problems of the world today.

[Agayants] You're absolutely right, Viktor Nikolayevich. This new constructive step by the countries in the fraternal community has been met with approval by the very broadest circles of progressive public opinion around the globe. Today all of us, wherever we live and whatever views we hold, are faced with the historic choice of either permitting a further slide down the path of confrontation and the arms race toward the abyss of nuclear self-destruction, or of finally bringing our way of thinking and acting into line with the realities of the nuclear space age and restructuring international relations on the bases of cooperation and combined action to preserve and consolidate peace.

It was proceeding from this premise that the fraternal countries of the socialist community put forward their important new initiative in the United Nations. Their draft resolution reads as follows and I quote: The General Assembly, being profoundly concerned at the tense and dangerous world situation and the threat of a slide along the path of confrontation and the arms race toward the abyss of the nuclear self-destruction of mankind, taking into account the urgent need to strengthen the foundations of universal security on the basis of the UN Charter and observation of the generally recognized norms and principles of international law, taking into account the growing interdependence between countries and the fact that the world today there is no sensible alternative to the policy of cooperation and interaction between countries pursued on the basis of equality and unconditional respect of every nation to be sovereign in choosing the paths and forms of its development, reasserting the important role of the United Nations as an irreplaceable forum for holding talks and reaching agreement on measures to strengthen international peace, security and cooperation and to democratize international relations, and having discussed the question of setting up an all-embracing international security system, calls upon states to concentrate their efforts on guaranteeing equal security for all and in all spheres of international relations and, to this end, to make their contribution to drawing up a document containing the basic principles of an all-embracing international security system.

[Sishkin] In this connection I would like to recall that more than a year has now passed since the Soviet Union unilaterally put a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The decision to take that extremely substantial and very important step to end the nuclear arms race was an act truly unique in international practice which has promoted the enhancement of the Soviet Union's prestige on the international scene and the strengthening of our country's position on disarmament questions. The Soviet Union has once again shown itself a state which takes practical action to help eliminate the nuclear threat and reduce the danger of nuclear war. The moratorium focused the attention of governments and the world public on this key question of nuclear disarmament. It is by no means accidental that the leaders of the countries in the Delhi Six--namely, Mexico, Argentina, India, Greece, Sweden and Tanzania--who gathered in the Mexican town of Ixtapa for their second meeting and adopted the so-called Mexican Declaration, put in the forefront of urgent disarmament measures the question of ending all nuclear explosions. The declaration they adopted reads as follows, and I quote: We express the certain conviction that there is at present no more pressing and important task than to end all nuclear tests, which spur on the arms race. In addition, it is evident that the further improvement of nuclear weapons by the state possessing them is damaging the attempts to prevent the acquisition of such weapons by the countries which have so far refrained from doing so.

[Levin] It's probably a good idea to go into more detail about that meeting in the Mexican town of Ixtapa, not least because the Delhi Six that you just mentioned, Gennadiy Arkadyevich, are, I think, playing an increasingly noticeable role in international life. I should like to tell you about what the leaders of the six states said there so that you can get a clearer idea

of the mood at that meeting. For example, this is what Argentine President Alfonsín said: The balance of terror is not serving to prevent war; on the contrary it is provoking war. It is now quite clear that we cannot now go on preventing a nuclear world war by means of an arms race which is growing *ad infinitum*.

One reason I draw attention to those words is that they clearly express the very same idea that has been expressed on numerous occasions by the leaders of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries: the idea that this theory of the balance of error, to use a phrase, in which the Western powers put their faith, must be replaced by the theory of security based on the elimination of the arms race.

Now here is what Swedish Premier Carlsson had to say: We consider the most important thing on the path toward preventing the continuing nuclear arms race to be the ending of all nuclear explosions. It was this point that was also given the very clearest and most vivid expression in the declaration which you mentioned, Gennadiy Arkadyevich.

Here again we find consonance with the historic proposals that have been put forward by the Soviet Union, and first and foremost with the proposal of 15 January 1986 for a 3-stage elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. This interlinking between the Soviet approach to international affairs and the views of the Delhi Six is a very characteristic feature, for its marks and high road, the main direction of mankind's thinking with a view of safeguarding peace. We are sincerely in favor of peace. It is what we proposed in the initiative that you were speaking of, Nikolay Ivanovich, which has been put forward for the next session of the UN General Assembly, and in a whole number of other documents. I have already mentioned the proposal for eliminating nuclear weapons: There is also our concrete proposal for limiting conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe, and a broad program for safeguarding security in the Pacific region was put forward by Comrade Gorbachev in his Vladivostok speech. It is in the interests of all mankind, and this was shown, to my mind very vividly and convincingly, by the Ixtapa meeting of the Delhi Six.

[Shishkin] I have to agree with you, Viktor Nikolayevich, that this question of a new mode of thought, of the primary human right, the right to live, is receiving ever wider international recognition. This is reflected not only in the decisions of the Delhi Six, but also, I think, in the fact that there is more and more vigorous discussion of the subject in the United States. For instance, here is what the well-known U.S. scientist Von Hippel has said: The unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions introduced by the Soviet Union is of extraordinary importance and has had an enormous influence on world public opinion. It has demonstrated the Soviet Union's growing confidence in the new way of thinking. Indeed, new ways of thinking are growing and gaining strength in many countries and regions of the world. Striking evidence of this is provided, I think, by the fact that, for instance, the majority of physicists from the leading U.S. universities have signed an open letter announcing their refusal to work on the star wars program, which they consider criminal and dangerous. Reflecting the mood of the broad U.S.

public, the U.S. Senate has passed a resolution calling on the administration to join the moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union and start talks with our country on a total nuclear test ban.

[Agayants] But at the same time, Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, it's now perfectly plain that the Soviet moratorium has put the U.S. Administration, which is still continuing nuclear tests, in a difficult position. What it amounts to is that Washington has set itself up in opposition to the overwhelming majority of the world's states. By refusing to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union to stop all nuclear tests, the United States is, in the first place, failing to fulfill the international obligations that it has undertaken, second, it is provocatively ignoring the unanimous will of the world community.

[Shishkin] That is quite true. The United States has indeed pledged itself to wage the struggle to stop nuclear weapon tests, a pledge that dates back to the preamble to the partial test ban treaty in 1963. It is also contained in another international document bearing the signature of the United States; namely, Article 6 of the 1968 treaty on nuclear nonproliferation.

During the considerable time that has elapsed since then, the Soviet Union has repeatedly put forward concrete proposals on how that obligation might be translated into reality. In response to numerous demands by the leaders of a number of states, scientists and prominent public figures, and in order to get things moving again, on 6 August 1985 the Soviet Union announced its unilateral moratorium which has subsequently been extended several times. The United States, on the other hand, has still not followed this good example, and is, on the contrary, doing all it can to sabotage solving this problem, which is important to the whole of mankind.

Washington initially sought to justify its unwillingness to stop nuclear explosions by appealing to the alleged lack of reliable means of verification; but that, of course, was merely a ruse. In the opinion of the most authoritative experts, among them U.S. experts, the cessation of nuclear tests can be effectively verified by each country, using its own facilities. Moreover, the Soviet Union has long since declared its willingness to agree to international control, and to certain measures of on-site monitoring. Not only that, but our country has further demonstrated its willingness to accept this by consenting to the installation of U.S. seismological equipment near Semipalatinsk; that is, in the area where Soviet nuclear tests were conducted.

[Levin] Incidentally, even now, after the Soviet Union has made the relevant announcements and performed definite acts, the question of monitoring still remains, for the U.S. Administration, an argument for refusing to stop nuclear explosions. At the conference at Ixtapa, the leaders of the Delhi Six put forward a proposal. They said: We are willing, together with the United States and the Soviet Union, to participate in collective efforts, and also to take certain steps on our own initiative, to promote the achievement of adequate methods of verification. So there you are: Six states are willing to help solve this problem, and it's an interesting initiative.

[Shishkin] Washington has been driven into a corner and has finally been forced to admit that its refusal to take the step of ending nuclear tests has nothing whatever to do with the problem of control. The United States needs nuclear tests to continue the nuclear arms race. It's common knowledge, after all, that the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of weapons is inseparably linked with those tests. Thus, nuclear tests whip up the arms race and help create new and more destructive nuclear weapons. They also extend the possibility of their use. That is why stopping the tests is really the key problem if we are to limit, materially and physically, the practical possibilities for producing new specimens of nuclear bombs and warheads. The fact is that without tests, the nuclear arms race would, in time, become an impossibility. The stubborn determination of the United States to continue nuclear explosions at all costs stands in flagrant contradiction to the aspirations of all mankind, which longs to rid itself of the nuclear threat, and to Washington's official assurances that it is striving to achieve the same purpose.

It is precisely in the matter of nuclear explosions, whose end the whole world demands, that we see in its most naked form the disinclination of the United States, its ruling circles, to embark on the path of nuclear disarmament.

[Agayants] We often speak, and rightly, of the military and political consequences of the arms race that the imperialists have unleashed, but unfortunately, we less often refer to its socioeconomic aspect.

[Agayant] Summing up what has been said today, I should like to recall this point: The USSR has actively acted and acts in favor of holding an international conference on issues concerning the interrelationship of disarmament and development.

In view of the USSR, the main tasks of this conference should be the constructive consideration of the problem of ways to release additional resources for development purposes as a result of practical arms-limitation measures. The other Warsaw Treaty member states also support this course. As noted in the communique of the Budapest conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries, they attach great significance to holding an international conference on disarmament and development in keeping with the UN decisions. The USSR and the other socialist states are doing a great deal of work in the social and economic bodies and specialized institutions within the UN system with the aim of involving them in preparations for this international conference, and, on a broader level, in assisting the cause of disarmament and removing the threat of nuclear war.

The time allotted to our broadcast has come to an end. Thank you, comrades, for your attention. All the best.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS CITES SWEDISH CDE DELEGATE ON TEST BAN VERIFICATION

LD052229 Moscow TASS in English 2056 GMT 5 Aug 86

[Text] Geneva, 5 Aug (TASS)--A comprehensive banning of nuclear tests would be of serious importance in ending the stepping up of the nuclear arms race, a TASS correspondent was told by head of the Swedish delegation at the conference of disarmament, Ambassador Rolf Ekeus. This question causes concern of entire humanity. In order to be effective, the ban must be global and verifiable.

The main means of verification of the observance of the ban on nuclear testing is a worldwide network of seismic stations capable of registering seismic phenomena and of distinguishing with high reliability natural phenomena or those that are a result of man's activity. This work requires international cooperation going far beyond the framework of a mechanism which could be used in case only nuclear powers were interested in this.

"We draw the conclusion that the ban on nuclear testing can be verified by seismic observations providing there is world international cooperation. This could be supplemented with some other methods. This idea is gaining the support of the majority of the participants in the conference," the head of the Swedish delegation said.

Sweden's representative also pointed to an important role of the Geneva conference as a unique multilateral instrument of talks on questions of security and disarmament. According to him, the conference makes an important political conclusion in this respect to safeguarding peace and stability. It also enables non-aligned and neutral states to exert constructive influence on the international talks on disarmament. For military and economic security of those states it is vitally important to arrest and scale down the arms race on which the vast resources of the globe are squandered. From practical viewpoint, non-aligned and neutral states can make a positive contribution to working out new ideas, can advance compromise proposals and exert on the whole a stimulating influence on the conference.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS CITES SEISMOLOGISTS' REPORT TO CD

LD141934 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 14 Aug 86

[Text] Geneva August 14 TASS -- The special group of experts on seismology today submitted their fourth report to the Disarmament Conference.

Its chairman, Ola Dalman (Sweden), stressed that the group's activity brought about useful results. Its effort, he said, should be directed at establishing a global network to exchange second-level seismological data and setting up special centres to receive, process and transmit this information.

For these purposes, Dalman said, it was necessary:

- to work out technical specifications for modern stations that would be capable of obtaining and exchanging data on seismic events irrespective of distances;
- to develop and test methods, procedures and technical means for detecting seismic signals;
- to perfect and test communication systems for transmitting second- and first-level data from national seismic stations to international centres;
- to perfect and test methods, procedures and technical means for their use at international centres on processing and exchanging second-level data between such centres,

In its further work, Dalman said, the group was planning to discuss a large-scale experiment on exchanging second-level data. The experiment, to include also first-level data exchanges, would be carried out with the use of channels of the global telecommunication system of the world meteorological organization and other communication means. As many nations as possible should take part in the experiment.

Australia's representative, Richard Butler, observed, in turn, that the international community was possessing at present all necessary elements for establishing a global seismological network.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: REPORTS ON DELHI SIX MESSAGE TO REAGAN

Consultations Urged

LD131827 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 13 Aug 86

[Text] Mexico City, 13 Aug (TASS)--The leaders of the "Delhi Six" gathered in Ixtapa, Mexico, to discuss measures which could promote a balanced control over armaments and disarmament, says the message of the "Delhi Six" to President of the United States Ronald Reagan. The document dated 7 August was circulated by Mexico's Ministry of Foreign Affairs today.

The leaders of the "Delhi Six" noted with satisfaction that the USSR and the U.S. had recently embarked on bilateral talks on nuclear tests. The leaders of the "Delhi Six" propose a meeting of experts from their countries with Soviet and American experts. The date and venue of the meeting could be agreed upon by mutual consultations. The meeting could be aimed at a detailed setting out of the proposals of the "Delhi Six", the studying of the methods of their implementation in practice and other possible measures by means of which the countries could promote verification of the ban on nuclear testing.

The "Delhi Six", the message says, declares for a broad working program comprising any aspect of verification which the experts might deem important.

PRAVDA Commentary

PM131031 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Veniamin Shurygin "Commentator's Column": "The 'Mexico Declaration'"]

[Text] This is the name of the document drawn up and adopted at the recent meeting in the Mexican city of Ixtapa of the leaders of six states -- Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden, and Greece. The "Mexico Declaration," like the second meeting of the "Delhi Six" itself, has generated widespread response around the world. Making a high assessment of these countries' actions aimed at curbing the arms race, the world press notes that they will promote progress in seeking ways of strengthening security and mobilizing the international public's efforts in support of disarmament.

The leaders of the "Six" countries located on different continents have been working purposefully and constructively for more than 2 years now seeking a solution to the main question of the day -- preventing a thermonuclear catastrophe. The "Mexico Declaration," as many observers are now noting, is an important new step in this direction. It is distinguished by the scale and acuteness with which it poses the most pressing problems of the day. There must be no repetition of the Hiroshima tragedy -- that is the theme of the document. It is impossible to achieve greater security by building up the potential for destruction, the declaration states. Nuclear disarmament and, ultimately, the complete elimination of nuclear weapons are an absolute priority.

The appeal from Mexico for the unilateral Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which has already been in force for more than a year, to become at least bilateral -- with the United States joining it -- is extremely topical in the current international situation.

During the meeting the participants welcomed other peace-loving Soviet initiatives, including the proposals on the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this century and the measures proposed by the Soviet Union for safeguarding the peoples' peace and security, eliminating seats of tension, and organizing constructive cooperation among states in different parts of the world. The new, large-scale, constructive proposals set forth recently in Vladivostok were a vivid example of this Soviet approach to world problems.

It is no secret that the West is trying to impose on young states the idea that the problem of disarmament -- particularly nuclear disarmament -- and other questions linked with the prevention of thermonuclear warfare concern only those countries which have these mass destruction weapons at their disposal. The entire activity of the "Six" and the documents they have adopted attest to the groundlessness of this approach.

Today it is a question of the survival of all mankind. We must all therefore jointly oppose the nuclear threat before it is too late. That is the main conclusion of the "Mexico Declaration" and the main thrust of the efforts of all people of good will.

U.S., Soviet Stances Contrasted

LD151412 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 15 Aug 86

["A New Thinking Is Needed -- TASS News Analysis" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow August 15 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

The leaders of countries that belong to the "New Delhi Six" called upon the U.S.S.R. and the United States to cooperate in implementing the idea of stopping nuclear weapon tests. They came out in favor of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, observed by the Soviet Union for more than one year now, becoming at least a bilateral arrangement.

There is no doubt that the Soviet leadership will give its reply to the "Mexican Declaration", the final document of the second meeting of the leaders of the "New Delhi Six".

But now I would like to draw one more time the attention of our readers to the difference in the stands of the U.S.S.R. and the United States on the issue of banning nuclear explosions. Our country attaches great importance to it. In concentrating its efforts in that sphere, the Soviet Union proceeds from the following considerations.

First, the question of terminating nuclear weapon tests, being an organic part of the general program for nuclear disarmament proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, January 15, 1986, at the same time lends itself to an independent solution, and a prompt one, too.

Second, despite the outwardly limited character of such a measure as the ban on nuclear tests, in actual fact their termination is the most realistic, the simplest and the most effective step toward stopping the nuclear arms race, and to a significant measure -- toward the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Third, the termination of nuclear explosions should to a significant degree promote the strengthening of the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, because efforts to modernize nuclear arms made by those countries which possess them are damaging attempts to prevent the acquisition of such weapons by the countries which refrained from doing so to date.

The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions has been highly praised the world over. Princeton University Prof F. Von Hippel described it as a momentous victory of the new way of thinking over the old one. Of course, it was not a simple thing for our country to extend the moratorium several times, because the United States has not slowed down the rate of modernization of its nuclear missile potential.

Consider the fact that in the duration of the Soviet moratorium the U.S. conducted 15 officially announced nuclear explosions.

Another fact should be taken into consideration -- according to the figures of the Swedish Defense Institute (so far no one has refuted them), the United States conducted 801 nuclear explosions as of January 1, 1986, while the Soviet Union -- 563.

The U.S. Administration so far has not responded to the Soviet gesture of goodwill. Conversely, in the coming decade it plans to add 13,000 to 20,000 nuclear warheads to the U.S. nuclear arsenal. In all, it is planned to produce 23,000 such warheads over that period and a number of them are intended as replacements for the older weapon systems.

Moreover, the United States is vigorously working to develop even more destructive types of nuclear arms which belong to the "third generation" of such weapons. These also include space-strike weapons intended for "star wars".

Against the background of all this Washington continues to maintain that the destruction of nuclear weapons is allegedly a "long-term goal" of the American policy. Can one consider such declarations to be sincere?

One would like to believe that the new thinking, so badly needed in our space and nuclear age, will finally make its way into the highest echelons of power in Washington. For there is no other alternative for enhancing universal security.

Reagan Response Hit

LD180930 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 18 Aug 86

[Text] Mexico City August 18 TASS -- TASS correspondent Valeriy Fesenko reports:

President Ronald Reagan has turned down the appeal of the heads of state and government of the "Delhi Six" not to conduct nuclear explosions until the coming Soviet-American summit meeting.

He said in an interview with the Mexican newspaper EXCELSIOR that the moratorium on nuclear explosions (the "Delhi Six" urge all the nuclear powers, primarily the U.S., to announce such a moratorium following the example of the USSR) would allegedly not promote the elimination of nuclear arsenals.

The President tried to explain the systematic conducting of nuclear tests by Washington by the "strategy of effective deterrence" and by the need for "additional armanment."

It follows from the interview that the U.S. is not going to stop nuclear tests in the near future as the first step towards the curbing of the nuclear arms race. The U.S. President tried to set the disarmament process to the nuclear arms control.

President Reagan again delivered stinging attacks on Cuba and Nicaragua. He justified the military assistance rendered by Washington to the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionaries, whom the U.S. uses as its proxy in its attempts to overthrow the lawful government of the sovereign country.

The same as before, the President shielded the reactionary Central American regimes which on the order of Washington disrupt the signing of the act of peace and cooperation. He asserted that Nicaragua posed a threat not only to its neighbours, but also to Mexico and even to the U.S. The U.S. President actually took under his protection the repressive regimes in Chile and Paraguay.

President Reagan's statement above the U.S. policy with regard to Latin America show that his administration is going to further grossly interfere in the internal affairs of the peoples of the continent under the cover of anti-communist slogans.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: DELHI SIX OFFER HELP IN VERIFYING TEST BAN

Text of Message

LD231752 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 23 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 23 TASS -- Follows the text of the message sent by the leaders of six states to Mikhail Gorbachev:

To Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev
general secretary of the Communist Party
of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Dear Mr. General Secretary

In our letters to you of October 24, 1985, February 28 and April 10, 1986, we expressed our fervent hope for the successful outcome of the current negotiations between your country and the United States.

You will recall that we called on both yourself and President Ronald Reagan to undertake a mutual suspension on nuclear testing, at least until your next summit meeting. We wish to express to you our sincere appreciation for having unilaterally extended your suspension of all nuclear tests. As you know we have been meeting in Ixtapa, Mexico, over the past two days to discuss ways in which we might be able to help facilitate progress in arms control and disarmament. We have adopted today the Mexico Declaration, the text of which will be duly transmitted to you.

We believe that we are in a position to make a contribution in the field of verification. We have outlined in a separate document some concrete ideas with respect to how we could assist in such verification. We welcome the fact that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have started bilateral talks recently on nuclear testing issues. We wish to propose to you that experts from our six nations meet with your and American experts. The details of time and place could be arranged through mutual consultations. The purpose should be to explain in detail the proposals which we have presented, to discuss how they could be implemented, and to explore other possible ways in which our six countries could facilitate test ban verification. We suggest a very open agenda covering any verification issue that your experts may consider important. We hope that by making this invitation to both you and President Reagan we might be able to assist in this crucial field.

[signed] Yours sincerely,
Raul Alfonsin, president of Argentina
Andreas Papandreu, prime minister of Greece
Rajiv Gandhi, prime minister of India
Miguel De la Madrid, president of Mexico
Ingvar Carlsson, prime minister of Sweden
Julius Nyerere, first president of Tanzania

S
Gorbachev Responds

PM231616 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Aug 86 First Edition p 1

["Reply by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Message From the Leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] To Mr Raul Alfonsin, president of Argentina,

Mr Andreas Papandreu, prime minister of Greece,

Mr Rajiv Gandhi, prime minister of India,

Mr Miguel De la Madrid, president of Mexico,

Mr Ingvar Carlsson, prime minister of Sweden,

and Mr Julius Nyerere, first president of Tanzania,

Esteemed Gentlemen!

I want to thank you for your message dated 7 August 1986 in which you put forward a specific new initiative aimed at starting to make progress in resolving the key question in reducing the risk of nuclear war -- that of ending nuclear weapon tests.

We fully agree with the conviction expressed in your declaration that the responsibility for protecting our planet is borne by all people living on it. Indeed, the task of preserving human civilization and not letting it be consumed in the flames of a nuclear catastrophe is the common cause of all states and all people. After all, were a nuclear war to begin, it would affect absolutely everyone.

We share your assessment of the fatal consequences to which the utilization of even a small part of the nuclear arsenals existing in the world could lead. The process of the improvement and further stockpiling of these arsenals continues and is served by nuclear weapon tests. This is why there is now no more urgent and important task than to end all nuclear tests. This measure would really help to stop the qualitative and quantitative growth of nuclear arsenals. We link with this measure the start of movement down the road leading to a nuclear-free world.

There are no obstacles to ending tests except certain powers' position, based on a suicidal gamble on nuclear muscle. The interests of preserving human civilization in the nuclear and space era urgently demand new political thinking. It must be based on a realization of the fact that the buildup of nuclear arsenals will not only not increase security but, on the contrary, may produce "zero" security, that is, total self-annihilation.

Guided by a sense of responsibility for the fate of mankind, we initiated a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. And now, after it has been in effect for a year, the Soviet leadership has once again decided to extend it until the start of 1987. I want to emphasize that it was not easy for us to do this. After all, you know that the United States, despite our moratorium, is continuing to carry out nuclear explosions and therefore is advancing along the path of building up nuclear arsenals. [paragraph continues]

Nevertheless, we believe that our unilateral action is justified since it must help to solve the problem of nuclear tests and to deliver mankind from the nuclear threat. In taking this step we believe that people in all countries will correctly assess the protracted silence on Soviet test ranges.

I am deeply convinced that if the United States also joined the Soviet moratorium -- and our extension of the moratorium gives it an extra chance to do so -- a substantial and responsible step would be taken toward ending the improvement and stockpiling of the most destructive weapons.

Such a bilateral moratorium would certainly aid the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests under the terms of a treaty. The verification [kontrol] measures that would be elaborated to monitor compliance with the moratorium could, as you correctly note, be an important step on the way to creating a system for monitoring compliance with a treaty totally banning explosions. From the general political viewpoint a moratorium would create good preconditions for concluding such a treaty.

We believe that the Soviet-American talks that began in Geneva in late July ought to be oriented toward this objective. The Disarmament Conference could become an important forum for multilateral talks on this problem if the artificial barriers hampering its effective activity on preparing a draft treaty banning the carrying out of any test explosions are removed.

We believe that the United Nations, where the question of ending nuclear weapons tests has been discussed for over 30 years, has still not exhausted its potential in resolving this question and should make more active use of its potential.

In our view, efforts in this sphere must be implemented in all directions; some talks should not preclude or supplant others, but on the contrary, they should complement them. Proceeding from this premise, it seems to me that the meeting of experts from the six countries with Soviet and American experts that you propose could make a valuable contribution to achieving the goal of the all-embracing prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and initiate an active, business-like multilateral dialogue on these questions. We are prepared to send Soviet experts to such a meeting.

The Soviet Union has already expressed its readiness to take advantage of your offer of assistance in verifying [proverka] the end of nuclear explosions, including on-site inspections [inspektsii na mestakh], provided it is also accepted by the other side, of course. It would of course be useful to discuss together your new proposals and to seek mutually acceptable solutions of the problem of verifying [kontrol] that nuclear tests are not being carried out.

As is evident from the "Mexico Declaration" that you adopted, we share the same approach in assessing the serious consequences with which the transformation of space into a new sphere of the arms race would be fraught. Like you, we are convinced that space must be used only for peaceful purposes, in the interests of all mankind. This is what underlies the initiative recently put forward by our country envisaging the development of international cooperation in preventing an arms race in space and in its peaceful exploration. At the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms we have submitted specific proposals aimed at ensuring that space does not become an arena for military rivalry. We advocate strengthening the regime of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, which under present conditions constitutes the foundation of strategic stability, and [we advocate] complete, strict compliance with all provisions of this unlimited-duration document.

In our view, the quickest reaching of an accord between the USSR and the United States on banning strike-space arms of the "space-to-earth" and "space-to-space" classes and on banning antisatellite systems and eliminating such facilities as the sides already possess is of great importance. The Soviet Union is open both to resolving the wide complex of these problems as a whole and to seeking separate accords ultimately leading to the aforementioned goal -- reliably barring the way to the placing of weapons in space.

In the "Mexico Declaration" you also touch on the question of a new Soviet-American summit. The Soviet Union is in favor of holding such a meeting. But this new meeting must aid the normalization of relations between the USSR and the United States, the improvement of the international situation, and the acceleration of the course of arms reduction talks. For instance, at such a meeting we would be prepared to sign an agreement on ending nuclear tests. In short, the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States must be truly meaningful. It is this that is the essence of the accord between the two countries' leaders in Geneva.

In conclusion I want to express the confidence that our joint efforts to curb the arms race and end nuclear weapons tests will ultimately find expression in specific measures leading to the attainment of this important objective.

[signed] Respectfully,

M. Gorbachev

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTING SOUTH PACIFIC NFZ ACCORD

Protocols Approved

PM181153 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Aug 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "For a Nuclear-free Zone"]

[Text] Canberra, 9 Aug -- Another step toward officially declaring the southern part of the Pacific a nuclear-free zone was taken at the latest session of the South Pacific Forum in the capital of Fiji, Suva. Its participants agreed and approved protocols to the treaty on such a zone which was concluded at last year's session of the forum -- an organization which unites 13 countries in that part of the world. The treaty stipulates that its participants must not produce or acquire "any nuclear explosive devices." Testing nuclear weapons and dumping radioactive waste in the Pacific are also banned.

An important role in the practical implementation of the treaty is to be played by the protocols to the treaty to be submitted for signature by all powers which possess nuclear weapons. Although the Soviet Union and China have expressed themselves clearly in support of the nuclear-free zone, France, which carries out its nuclear tests in the area, and the United States and Britain have put forward a whole series of objections.

U.S. 'Hostility'

LD111221 Moscow TASS in English 1137 GMT 11 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow, 11 Aug (TASS)--TASS political news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov reports:

The session of the South Pacific Forum which ended today in Suva, capital of the insular state of Fiji, was an important step towards the practical implementation of the treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific region.

Participants in the session representing 13 countries of that vast region coordinated and approved protocols to the treaty which will be submitted for signing to all the nuclear powers. After signing them those powers will have to uphold and respect the nuclear-free status of the South Pacific basin.

The South Pacific region was proclaimed to be a nuclear-free zone by the countries situated there at the session of the South Pacific forum a year ago, in August 1985. The treaty on the creation of the zone which has been ratified already by most participants in the forum bans the production and deployment of nuclear weapons in the region, as well as its testing and the dumping of radioactive waste in the ocean. South Pacific countries pledge not to acquire any nuclear devices.

Members of the South Pacific forum are full of resolve to strictly fulfill the treaty obligations. The recent session furnished enough proof to it. However, there remains the problem of the attitude of nuclear powers to the status of the zone proclaimed by the South Pacific countries. Early this year delegations of the South Pacific Forum visited Moscow and Washington in connection with the preparation of the above mentioned protocols.

The Soviet Union fully supported the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific region and urged all the nuclear powers to guarantee its status unilaterally or on a multilateral basis. The USSR believes that the creation of the zone is an important contribution to the formation of a reliable security system in the Asian-Pacific region.

So far as Washington is concerned, the proclaiming of the South Pacific region to be a nuclear-free zone evoked hostility there, since this step is regarded as a barrier on the way to the U.S. military buildup in the region.

During his recent tour of a number of South East Asian countries, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz described it as a mistake. Ronald Hays, commander-in-chief of the U.S. Armed Forces in the area of the Pacific and Indian oceans stated point-blank that the U.S. military strongly opposed the nuclear-free zone.

London solidarizes with the U.S. stand, while France, by all appearances, is going to further conduct underground nuclear explosions at its testing ground in Muruoa. Paris is very much dissatisfied, if not irritated, over the fact that the member countries of the South Pacific Forum came out ever more resolutely at the recent session in favor of the granting of independence to New Caledonia. They suggested that the problem of the decolonization of this French overseas territory be discussed at the UN.

Realizing that it will not be able to prevent the adoption of the protocols to the treaty on the nuclear-free zone at the recent session of the South Pacific Forum, the United States tried to weaken those documents. Under its pressure the provision was included in the protocols which permitted nuclear powers--signatories to it to turn down the recognition of the treaty under 'emergency circumstances', explaining the reasons of this step to the members of the forum in a three-month term.

According to the Australian press, Washington and London made it clear that if the provision was not included, they would boycott the treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific region.

And still, the session held in Fiji showed that the anti-nuclear feelings were strong even in such far-away parts of the world, that South Pacific countries did not want to be nuclear hostages of the Pentagon and their supreme interest was the ensuring of peace and reliable security. Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pointed out in his Vladivostok speech that the realization of the need of peace for all was forcefully grasping the minds of the peoples. It is really peace for all, since a nuclear war will lead to a worldwide catastrophe and will jeopardize the existence of the human civilization.

Broadcast to Japan

OW161401 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 14 Aug 86

[Afonin commentary]

[Excerpts] Listeners, the 13-nation South Pacific Forum wound up its conference the other day in Suva, capital of Fiji. In this connection, Radio Moscow commentator Afonin makes the following comments:

The conference took important measures to establish a nuclear-free South Pacific Zone. A communique issued a call to nuclear powers to cease nuclear tests and stop dumping nuclear waste in the oceans of the world. One year ago, the 13 nations made a declaration, at their meeting, calling for a ban on the production, deployment, and testing of nuclear weapons in their expansive region. At the recent meeting, the participants adopted a final-version protocol, which further develops the concept of a treaty for a nuclear-free South Pacific. The 13 South Pacific nations thus expressed the desire to end any moves to turn their region into a site for nuclear tests and to completely free the South Pacific from nuclear arms. This was strongly demanded by the representatives of the Solomon Islands, the Vanuatu Republic, and Papua New Guinea. The governments of these countries expressed the hope that ships and airplanes carrying nuclear arms would be prohibited from passing through the nuclear-free zone. [passage omitted]

The peoples in Asia call for establishing nuclear-free zones. This is because they do not want to turn into U.S. nuclear [words indistinct]. The Soviet people understand and sympathize with this sentiment of the Asian peoples.

In his Vladivostok speech, General Secretary Gorbachev said the Soviet Union supported the declaration for a nuclear-free South Pacific zone and called on all nuclear powers, singlehandedly or jointly, to guarantee this declaration. In this speech, General Secretary Gorbachev put forth the task of preventing expansion and reinforcement of nuclear arms in Asia and the Pacific region. This provides a clear reply to occasional criticism that the Soviet Union is maneuvering to expand its military influence in Asia.

Lastly, we would like to mention that the Soviet Union has been following the same policy in its relations with Japan. Several years ago, the Soviet Union already expressed to Japan that it would guarantee the nonuse of nuclear arms against Japan if the latter gives firm assurances that it would abide by the three nonnuclear principles.

To our regret, however, there is substantial evidence to our belief that Japan's three nonnuclear principles have been violated by the United States. Sooner or later, the Japanese Government will become aware that U.S. nuclear weapons and their delivery devices have actually been driving Japan into a very fragile position. It is necessary for the benefit of the peoples of Japan and other countries as soon as possible to participate in the process of creating a comprehensive Asian security system, based on peace-loving spirit, not war capabilities. The antinuclear movement in various Pacific nations clearly shows that only this security plan has bright future prospects.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW REPORTS PLANS FOR MEETING ON KOREAN NFZ

SK280538 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 27 Aug 86

[Text] An international meeting to make the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free peace zone will be held early this September in Pyongyang. A station reporter met G.Z. Loanisyan, secretary of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries, and asked him about the topics to be discussed at the international meeting.

[Begin Loanisyan recording in Russian, fading into Korean translation] I believe that the international meeting will be of great significance in preserving peace and security on the Korean peninsula. This is because the situation in the Far East is directly linked to the situation of Asia and the Pacific and the alleviation of the situation in these regions will also greatly contribute to alleviating the situation on the Korean peninsula.

Delegations of the countries from two continents, including the socialist countries, will participate in this meeting. A delegation from the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries will represent our country.

The Korean peninsula has long been one of the militarily tense regions in the world. South Korea has been turned into a bridgehead of Washington's military strategy. In South Korea, there are some 40,000 U.S. troops and more than 1,000 nuclear weapons of various types have been deployed there. The Pentagon will deploy various types of lethal weapons, including Pershing and [word indistinct] missiles, in South Korea. [end Loanisyan recording]

Secretary Loanisyan continued: The DPRK has made every effort possible to eliminate the danger of war on the Korean peninsula and to resolve the country's reunification peacefully. International social circles have highly evaluated the DPRK's proposal for establishing a nuclear-free peace zone on the Korean peninsula.

In South Korea, such a war exercise as the "Team Spirit" military exercise has been staged despite the DPRK's peace proposals.

Speaking of the policies of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, they are seeking to eliminate the danger of nuclear war and to prevent mankind from becoming the victim of a nuclear holocaust. Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has advanced a program to completely abolish nuclear and chemical weapons from the earth by the end of the 20th century. This program completely accords with the (?desire) of the Asian people to preserve peace and security. In fact, large quantities of nuclear weapons have been stockpiled in Asia.

Our country has supported the DPRK's proposal for eliminating the danger of nuclear weapons from the Korean peninsula. This is also natural. We have firmly united with the Korean friends for the struggle for building a new society, for solid peace, and for social progress.

In conclusion, Secretary Loanisyan stated: The Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries has issued on many occasions statements supporting the DPRK's peace-loving policy and the republic's proposals for withdrawing U.S. forces and nuclear weapons from South Korea, for establishing a nuclear-free peace zone on the Korean peninsula, and for reunifying the country peacefully under democratic principles.

The Soviet delegation will support once again this cause of the fraternal Korean people at the Pyongyang international meeting.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: LATVIAN OFFICIAL DISCUSSES NORDIC NFZ ISSUE

PM021418 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 26 Jul 86 p 7

[Undated interview with Latvian Deputy Foreign Minister Nikolay Neyland by Larserik Haggman: "Nordic Nuclear-free zone: New Soviet Steps Should Not Be Ruled Out"]

[Text] Riga--"I do not rule out the possibility of new Soviet steps to aid the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area. But for the time being it is too early to speculate about such steps," Latvian Deputy Foreign Minister Nikolay Neyland told HUFVUDSTADSBLADET. He stressed that the ball is now in the court of the Nordic countries themselves.

The deputy foreign minister, who has been a Soviet negotiator in both Geneva and Vienna, has a journalistic background and worked in Sweden for many years, for example. He spoke fluent Swedish in his conversation with HUFVUDSTADSBLADET.

On the subject of assertions that the zone could become no longer of interest or that time could overtake it as a result of developments in arms technology and the situation between the superpowers he declared:

"There are always risks, but the only thing that could make the zone no longer of interest would be if we were to happen to find ourselves at war. The fact that people in Oslo for example have wanted to link the whole thing to central Europe seems completely impossible to understand."

Neyland pointed to the cooperation between the Nordic countries that functions well and the confidence between the countries that this represents. "Now Sweden is ready, Finland put forward the proposal long ago, and the Soviet Union has promised to give guarantees."

Why is it impossible to set a good example when there are no nuclear arms deployed, Neyland asked. It might be too late if any such weapons were deployed at some point. "For a long time there were speculations about Murmansk. Now there are no longer any demands on that point. This is because strategic parity is always an issue and necessary as long as there is no war," he added.

The Soviet Baltic republic has always had a very special interest in the Nordic area. According to Heyland this is connected with historical, cultural, and geographic tradition. "Now the United States has clearly increased its influence in the Nordic area, primarily in Norway and Denmark."

"The basic question is: Who decides what is a crisis situation," Neyland said, referring to increased military cooperation and contingency stockpiling. "Is it Norway or the United States that defines a crisis?"

According to the Latvian deputy foreign minister it is also a particular Baltic interest that the Nordic area should be kept nuclear-free and calm.

"We support the Kekkonen plan and all the steps taken toward a zone and have been concerned that Kare Willoch's Conservative government in Norway in particular has been speaking a different language," Neyland said.

He pointed out that stress has always been placed on the good relations with Finland and Sweden, but made no secret of his dislike of what he called "the anti-Soviet campaign" in Sweden.

"Unfortunately we ourselves helped to set it in motion with the unfortunate navigational error and the grounding of submarine 137. Washington was unable to conceal its delight at 'Whisky on the Rocks.'"

Neyland spoke of laughable features in the continued campaign. "At first I had a good laugh at the reports that specialist Soviet forces equipped with minisubmarines were planning to kidnap the Swedish king in the middle of Stockholm. I thought it was only Americans who could invent things like that for other Americans who do not know anything about Sweden."

But, he added, all the hullabaloo gave ammunition to the right-wing circles and those who wanted to rearm.

"But I am still surprised that Sweden lost its head and gave free rein to hysteria," said Neyland, who spent 8 years in the country. He finds the Swedish conclusions completely unreasonable and asked why the Soviet Union should want to do anything like what the allegations have amounted to.

"We were satisfied with our relations with Sweden and had absolutely no interest in damaging them." Neyland pointed to the geographical closeness and the significance of this factor for the need for low tension and working relations with the whole of the Nordic area.

Finland surfaced as the example during the conversation and the minister pointed out that we should not forget the situation immediately before and after World War II. He mentioned the Winter War and the "Continuation War" and the interventionist attempts even earlier. "Now things are very different," he said, and began to talk about the causes of the increased tension in the northern regions.

He referred to the American military's analyses that wars cannot be won in the Nordic area, but they can be lost: "Such ideas are used to justify all the steps that are taken--the clear increase in activity, the maneuvers, and so on."

Neyland also spoke of blackmail against Sweden. He mentioned the trade blockade against the Soviet Union, and also the calls from the United States to maintain defenses at a high level since reductions would mean danger for the whole area.

When HUFVUDSTADSBLADET asked about attitudes to Sweden's defense forces or the defense of neutrality which is talked about in Sweden and the importance of these for stability in the Nordic area Neyland said: "The best guarantees of security are achieved through political means. When this is true of a superpower like the Soviet Union which demonstrates a constant readiness to effect reductions, how can it possibly not apply to a country like Sweden?"

"What could Sweden or others do with their military in the nuclear age in which we live? The tragic accident at Chernobyl is the best proof that I am right."

According to Neyland the Soviet Union has one thing to thank Ronald Reagan for: "Thanks to him people have become more interested in foreign policy. People are no longer uninterested and no longer think that 'the politicians will be able to look after that.'"

According to the Latvian minister what is now beginning to become apparent is a "survival instinct" and things have become easier for Mikhail Gorbachev when he "straightforwardly and simply" talks about what is at stake.

"People in the Soviet Union know that Reagan can force a burden on them. They know that this could amount to a brake on internal development. That is something we can thank Reagan for," Neyland said.

He returned to the Nordic area and the conversation turned to the U.S. fleet, primarily in the north: "It is a danger. I am not saying that it is ready to start a war, but we cannot remain indifferent."

Neyland pointed to the Nordic zone, to where the United States stands and where the Soviet Union stands. He asked whether the next step will be nuclear-armed ships in the Baltic.

"We have shown goodwill. How everything depends on the Nordic area, on how far the Nordic countries can go," he concluded.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: JAPANESE PROTEST VISIT BY TOMAHAWK-ARMED 'NEW JERSEY'

PM251640 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own Correspondent S. Agafonov dispatch under the "Topical Reportage" rubric: "A Tomahawk Raised Above Sovereignty"]

[Text] Sasebo, Tokyo -- Sasebo Bay was made to be admired. If you look down on it from the observation platform on the top of Mount Yumiharidake, which dominates the harbor, a captivating vista opens up before you: the peaceful gulf, whose mirror-like semicircle seems to be embraced by the coastline, and the city, nestling at the very water's edge. In the other direction, looking out to the open sea, there is the delightful view of one of Japan's most beautiful scenes -- the picturesque little islands of Kujukushima, looking like seedlings sown in the blue water.

Unfortunately, Sasebo has long since ceased to be a haven for poets and landscape painters. The arbiters of fashion here wear military uniform and do not speak Japanese. And the bay, so romantic from on high, is ringed with barbed wire and adorned every 300 meters with signboards bearing the prosaic inscription: "Zone of U.S. Naval Operations."

Sasebo is the largest U.S. base on Kyushu island, a port of call for nuclear submarines of the U.S. 7th Fleet and an anchorage for aircraft carriers. This is the location of a command center for controlling U.S. naval operations in "emergencies" and is the destination of the refitted battleship the New Jersey, equipped with Tomahawk cruise missiles, which, according to schedule, will be mooring in Sasebo harbor on Sunday.

This ship's name appeared in the Japanese newspapers at the beginning of the year, when only the first rumors of the possibility of the battleship's visit to Japanese ports had appeared. Furthermore, even at that time, at rumor level, people were talking not about a single visit but a long-term stay by the floating monster in the land of the rising sun. The New Jersey has become a problem, an awkward topic for the Japanese mass media. Progressive antiwar organizations and opposition political parties sounded the alarm. Why? On average Japan receives around 100 U.S. warships a year. For example, atomic submarines have moored off Japanese coasts around 20 times in the first 6 months of this year alone. So why should the New Jersey attract such attention?

Summarizing the newspaper reports on this theme, as well the opinions of people I have met, the reason for the Japanese alarm is clear -- it is the presence on board the battleship of Tomahawk cruise missiles and the U.S. Navy's adoption of a new Pacific Ocean doctrine.

The Tomahawks, furthermore, are a constituent part of that doctrine. In Japan, however, sea-based nuclear cruise missiles deployed on the New Jersey represent a separate problem. It is common knowledge that the country has proclaimed the three nonnuclear principles: not to possess, produce, or acquire nuclear weapons. The visit to a Japanese port by a battleship carrying Tomahawk missiles in its armory is a direct violation of the nonnuclear principles.

To mark the New Jersey's visit a diplomatic show was staged in Tokyo on the eve its arrival. U.S. Ambassador Mike Mansfield was invited to a conversation with Japanese Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari. [paragraph continues]

The minister confirmed Japan's commitment to the three nonnuclear principles and asked the ambassador to treat Japan's "nuclear allergy" sympathetically, referring directly in this context to the battleship's upcoming visit to Sasebo. Mansfield took note of Kuranari's words but stressed that in accordance with the "established procedure," the United States neither confirms nor denies the presence of nuclear weapons on board its warships.

The dialogue between the minister and the ambassador, published by the newspapers in the form of a brief protocol, aroused a stream of commentaries. Their main content may be summarized as follows: diplomacy is diplomacy, but nuclear weapons are coming to Japan anyway. In confirmation the newspaper ASAHI, for example, cited the evidence of Edwin Reischauer, former U.S. ambassador to Japan, on the existence of a secret accord between Washington and Tokyo on this matter. As for the New Jersey there can be hardly any doubt here, since the battleship was equipped with nuclear Tomahawk missiles in the summer of 1984.

Now let us turn to the reports of speeches in the U.S. Congress by major officials of the State Department and the Pentagon, the text of which have appeared in the Japanese press. IZVESTIYA has already written about them. We will recall that we are dealing here with the U.S. Navy's new Pacific doctrine in which the Far East, including Japan, is assigned the role of "second front" in a war against the USSR. According to the Pentagon strategists' schemes, the deployment of Tomahawk nuclear missiles on board ships of the 7th Fleet will considerably increase America's offensive capability and will provide a powerful new first-strike potential and ensure nuclear superiority in the region. Reporting these plans, ASAHI rightly noted that if that happens Japan will inevitably be turned into a target for a retaliatory strike and will become a hostage of Washington's nuclear strategy. The New Jersey's visit to Sasebo is one milestone on that path.

Furthermore, the Japanese press notes that it not only the battleship's nuclear Tomahawks which pose a danger to Japan but its conventional armaments, too. "The New Jersey," ASAHI commentator T. Taoka believes, "is the ideal means for carrying out landing operations, since its guns can neutralize coastal defense more effectively than aircraft. America's plans for a landing on the Kuril Islands and Sakhalin are well known. The New Jersey is indispensable to their implementation. By all accounts, Sasebo is being turned into a center for staffing a shock assault group, with the New Jersey as a flagship. If there is a conflict, Japan will inevitably be drawn into it."

The commentator's conclusion is more than convincing. It is based on a sober assessment of the situation. Unfortunately, it is not one which prevails in official Tokyo today. Certain forces in Sasebo are by no means aware of their hostage status. The main tasks of the mayor's office and the police, as I was informed at city hall, are to localize protests by progressive forces and prevent disorder during the New Jersey's stay in the port. The main concern of storekeepers is the anticipation of large profits from the American sailors.

Koji Matsuo, a local businessman and chairman of the trade association, explained to me his "economic concept" of Sasebo, according to which the prosperity of the city's residents depends directly on the effectiveness of the military base. According to his logic, the more Americans there are stationed in Sasebo and the more often U.S. warships visit the port, the more satisfactory the local inhabitants' lives will be. This could be called powder keg optimism of making merry in the face of disaster. But it is not a matter of definitions. Matsuo was philosophizing without a trace of irony, seriously, and convinced that he was right.

Is this a case of indifference? Short-sightedness? or the hope that "luck will out." I put these questions to Takeichi Sasaki, a leader of the society for the study of military questions in Sasebo.

"Probably all three together," he replied. "And that today is a crime. The price may prove too high. The true patriot thinks about his country's future. Our future means a peaceful Japan without battleships, U.S. bases, or Tomahawks. Otherwise there will be neither peace nor calm. I am convinced that there are more of us than of those who are indifferent. The New Jersey will be met not only by storekeepers but by a powerful protest demonstration in which many thousands of people will take part. The battleship's path will be blocked in the straits by 50 peaceful fishing boats. We shall struggle!"

/9738

CSO: 5200/1540

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA VIEWS 'EXCOMMUNICATION' OF NEW ZEALAND

PM141133 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Aleksey Ivkin "Commentator's Column": "What They Are Being 'Punished' For"]

[Text] The United States has once again made a crude attack on its ANZUS ally -- New Zealand. As Secretary of State G. Shultz declared in San Francisco, "because of New Zealand's decision to betray a substantial element of its ANZUS membership, it has become impossible for the United States to fulfill its obligations to ensure New Zealand's security." Here Washington deliberately ignores repeated New Zealand statements, from Prime Minister D. Lange included, that nothing threatens New Zealand, but that it considers the presence of foreign nuclear weapons on its territory really dangerous.

Let us recall that the antinuclear policy of New Zealand's Labor government has long been irritating Washington. This was manifested particularly in February of last year, when that country's authorities categorically refused to admit American ships with nuclear weapons to New Zealand ports. The country's Parliament is now considering a law prohibiting any ships with nuclear propulsion systems or weapons from putting into its ports. It was precisely this step that Shultz proclaimed a "betrayal."

The United States has mounted a massive campaign to pressure New Zealand to abandon its antinuclear policy. And the present "excommunication" from the bloc is the culmination of this campaign. However, other circumstances also influenced Washington's choice of this moment to bang its fist on the table. Literally a few days ago the participants in the 17th South Pacific Forum Session in Fiji, including New Zealand, discussed practical steps to create a nuclear-free zone in the region. The session was held under the impression of the new peace-loving Soviet proposals advanced in Vladivostok about Asia and the Pacific and, in particular, of the support which the USSR gave to the idea of forming a nuclear-free zone there.

Washington considers antinuclear ideas "dangerous" for the region, where the United States has deployed many military bases and installations. The American Administration's actions again attest that any manifestation of independence in foreign policy by allies must, in the opinion of the White House, be punished. Then Washington is prepared to flout the sovereignty of the closest partners, international law, and public opinion (including opinion in the United States itself).

U.S. actions in trying to impose its will on other countries and to perpetuate the nuclear presence in the Pacific appear particularly provocative and self-exposing now that prospects are opening up for improving the situation there. The entire world sees how this runs counter to the fundamental aspirations and interests of the vast region's peoples.

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

RALLY URGES TEST BAN--Moscow, 4 Aug (TASS)--Four thousand young Muscovites demanded that the U.S. Administration should stop nuclear explosions. They did so at a meeting held at the Moscow Sokolniki Park this evening. The program of complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, proposed by the Soviet Union, enables the world to enter the new millenium without the dangerous burden of mistrust and threat of war, said Victor Mironenko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Leninist Young Communist League. We call upon our coevals in all countries to come out firmly in support of the program, until it is too late. Nikolay Prokhorov, 24-year-old metalworker of the Moscow "Salyut" production amalgamation, recalled that the USSR unilaterally ended nuclear tests a year ago. That humane step was approved by the broad circles of the world public. Nevertheless, the United States continues testing nuclear weapons. "I call upon my brothers in class, the workers of America all nuclear powers, to demand that their governments should join the Soviet moratorium, stop all nuclear tests, and open without delay negotiations on complete prohibition of weapons of mass destruction." The 20th century is running out, and the question is: will mankind be able to avoid the nuclear danger, says a resolution passed by the meeting. We call upon all young people to remove this question from the order of the day by uniting in the struggle for peace, disarmament and social justice. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 4 Aug 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1540

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA BEMOANS U.S. LEADERS' 'LEVEL OF POLITICAL THINKING'

PM271520 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Aug 86 First Edition pp 1, 4

[Report by own correspondent G. Vasilyev: "Will Reason Prevail?"]

[Excerpt] New York -- [Passage omitted] Americans knew that the Soviet moratorium ran out on 6 August and that Washington has responded to Moscow's goodwill with a series of nuclear explosions in Nevada. Many people here were wondering: How would the Soviet Union act in this situation? Would it resume the nuclear tests, for which it had every justification, or, to meet the wishes of the peace-loving public, extend the moratorium and give those who are beset by dreams of military superiority another chance to see reason. The "hawks" hoped that the former would be the case. They say that if the Soviets slam the door it will be easier for the U.S. military-industrial complex to do it black (as well as "gold") deeds, piling up mountains of nuclear and other weapons. But what the Pentagonites and arms manufacturers and all manner of ultrarightists were hoping for and what they were doing their utmost to provoke did not occur.

The Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium highlighted for the whole world to see the principled, peace-loving nature of the Soviet power's foreign policy and again focused public attention on the whole range of Soviet proposals aimed at curbing militarism and bringing about a change for the better in international affairs.

People of goodwill in the United States pay tribute to the Soviet Union's perseverance, consistency, and deep sense of responsibility for the fate of peace. But what about those who are cranking up the flywheel of the arms race, for whom to echo of explosions in Nevada is music to their ears?

I phoned the "Coalition for Peace Through Strength" in Washington, an ultrarightist organization with a membership of retired generals who have learned nothing, the most reactionary members of Congress, and anticommunist professors. When I said that I wanted to know their opinion of the Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium there was a profound silence at the other end, then they said that there was no expert on the matter available.

I dialed the number of another well-known ultrarightist center -- the "Committee on the Present Danger." They also refused to discuss the moratorium issue. The fact that the normally loud-mouthed "hawks" were struck dumb was indicative of embarrassment, fear of giving themselves away. The most valiant member of the army of ultrarightists is General Daniel Graham, former Pentagon intelligence chief, now director of "High Frontier" -- a militarist organization plugging the star wars plans. His retort was that the Soviet moratorium "has no special significance" since, in the general's view, the "salvation of mankind lies in the deployment of defensive weapons in space."

The "hawk" general is no sentimentalist. In fact, the U.S. Administration, his spiritual ally, also instantly rejected the USSR's proposal on concluding an agreement on halting nuclear tests, stating, through White House Press Secretary L. Speakes, that a "moratorium on nuclear tests does not accord with the interests of the United States and its friends and allies." The reasons for this stance were unashamedly stated: a desire to continue the development and improvement of nuclear armaments, primarily the nuclear charges for SDI, so dear to General Graham's bellicose heart, which are exploding in underground tunnels in Nevada. What is there to be ashamed of in that! Well, that's clear enough.

The White House's unconstructive and overtly militarist stance is bound to anger those people here who were hoping to see a gleam of reason in the actions of an administration approaching midterm, followed by presidential elections. In fact, the current situation in the United States is different from what it was when the right-wing Republicans came to power and announced that they would "leave communism on the garbage heap of history" and began the accelerated implementation of their 2 trillion dollar program for rearming the United States. The "hawks" no longer dominate the American political sky and legislators are no longer prepared to accept without demur the strongarm, confrontational solutions to international problems proposed by the administration. There are serious doubts about the correctness of this course, there is mounting criticism of it, and there are growing public demands for a serious look at questions of limiting the arms race.

Important causes lie at the root of the substantial changes that have appeared in the U.S. political climate. Five years and more of "military bodybuilding" have not brought the United States victories in the international arena, but have been a heavy burden on the country's economic organism. Awareness of the threat of nuclear catastrophe was a powerful, active political factor prompting action by the public -- scientists, doctors, the clergy, young people. The Soviet peace initiatives are having an enormous impact on the world. They have shown the real path to a more secure future and have given people hope that mankind can and must break the vicious circle of the arms race.

Recently President Reagan, obviously losing control of himself, angrily cursed the U.S. House of Representatives, accusing it of sins which would have gotten an American into serious trouble in the McCarthy era. He said that the legislators were "recklessly undermining U.S. national defense." These charges were made against congressmen, because, before leaving for their summer vacation, they voted for a whole series of decisions cutting the Pentagon budget and pushing the administration toward an agreement with the Soviet Union. Adopted in the form of amendments to the military appropriations bill, they deny the Pentagon funds for continuing nuclear tests in excess of one kiloton, prohibit the administration from deploying weapons which overstep the bounds of the SALT II Treaty, cut appropriations for the SDI program, extend the moratorium on antisatellite weapon tests, and deprive the Defense Department of funds for the production of binary and chemical charges.

One week before, a number of similar decisions, albeit in a milder form, had been adopted by the Senate. In September the Conference Committee of the two houses of Congress will coordinate the different versions. The White House is threatening to veto any "unacceptable" bill. But be that as it may, the fact remains. The legislators' "rebellion" reflects the growing antiwar mood in the country and on Capitol Hill.

It is sometimes written here that a struggle is going on deep within the U.S. Administration over questions of foreign and military policy. An influential group of the most active "fixers" upholding the interests of the military-industrial complex, such as Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, his assistant for international security R. Perle, and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director K. Adelman, who have the backing of the country's extreme right-wing forces, is dragging the country onto the path of a totally unbridled arms race and abandonment of existing Soviet-American accords. Judging by the administration's actual deeds, the "hawks" are still gaining the upper hand in debates in the Washington kitchen. The "moderates" can claim only a few propaganda ruses intended to calm the U.S. NATO allies and stifle criticism on Capitol Hill.

During the months since the Geneva summit Washington has been engaging in complex political acrobatics: It has been trying to simultaneously follow tracks leading in different directions. On the one hand, there has been no shortage of statements on the banks of the Potomac about wanting peace and wanting to seek constructive accords with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, every effort has been made to remove the last brake from the locomotive of the arms race and doom the Soviet-American talks to failure. It is becoming increasingly difficult to keep up the political balancing act.

Those who write about America tend to talk about the contrasts in this great country -- contrasts between wealth and poverty, between efficient mass production and society's meager spiritual reserves. One is now struck by another glaring contradiction: The massive gulf between the country's technological achievements and the level of its leaders' political thinking.

A striking contradiction, a dangerous contradiction. After all, not just the question of war and peace, but mankind's very future now depends on the behavior of the great power's leaders.

Fortunately, the United States is not completely bereft of sensible people whose clear thinking and broad views do the U.S. people proud. I phoned Salmon Creek in California, home of Linus Pauling, outstanding scientist, international Lenin Peace Prize winner and holder of two Nobel Prizes.

"The announcement that the Soviet Union has extended the moratorium on nuclear explosions was very gratifying," Professor Pauling said. "I have always advocated a general and complete nuclear test ban. The treaty would be an important step. Of course I know that President Reagan is against it, that he intends to continue testing new nuclear charges, especially for the SDI program, and that he wants to exhaust the Soviet Union in an arms race. But I have not lost hope. I would like to believe that realism will ultimately prevail in Washington.

"The arms race situation at the moment," Pauling continued, "is totally irrational. We cannot allow ourselves to use nuclear weapons -- it would be suicide for mankind. There is no other solution for us apart from peaceful coexistence. But the mountains of weapons continue to grow and the instruments of death are becoming more and more complex. The danger of a catastrophe as a result of technical defects or human error is increasing...There is little time left. I believe we can save peace. But for this we need a powerful, worldwide mass movement of peace supporters..."

As I listened to Pauling a rainy day in the distant past came to mind -- a column of demonstrators outside the United Nations and striding among them a tall, thin man carrying a placard demanding a halt to atomic tests in the atmosphere. Then, in 1963, the appeal by Pauling and millions of people like him was heard all over the world. Reason triumphed over politicking. The treaty banning nuclear tests in the three environments was concluded in Moscow. How relieved mankind would be if now, 23 years later, an agreement halting all nuclear tests were signed at a Soviet-American summit!

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S PETROVSKIY ON SECURITY IN MODERN CONDITIONS

Moscow INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS in English No 7, Jul 86 pp 28-33

[Article by D. Sc. (Hist.) V. Petrovskiy]

[Text] The fundamental principles of a comprehensive system of international security as laid down in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress have already been dealt with in the exchanges of opinions. In view of the exceptional importance of that new Soviet peace initiative I shall dwell on it in a more detailed manner.

The extremely complex and unfavourable and unprecedentedly explosive character of the world situation in the early half of the 1980s has acutely raised before all participants in the international intercourse an issue of working out a qualitatively new approach and a new way of political thinking in order to reverse the course of international affairs. It is high time to bring public consciousness in line with the realities of everyday life and fully to understand the stern facts, namely that the arms race has driven humankind to a critical line beyond which, taking into account the lethality of the new types of land-based and space weapons, life itself on Earth will be hanging by a thread which can break at any moment. It is only today that we begin to comprehend the full wisdom of Albert Einstein's words that modern weapons call for a new way of thinking if humankind wants to survive and to develop along the ascending line.

It is symbolic that practically all are now speaking about the need for new thinking. Yet, discourses on that score and the acknowledgement of the problem alone are no longer sufficient. A new way of thinking needs to be elaborated directly in the practice of international communication and it should be promptly translated into the language of specific actions. The task is, without turning a blind eye to the persistent social, political and ideological contradictions, to master the science and art of behaving oneself in the international arena in line with the new requirements, above all, restrainedly and prudently, for the survival of civilisation itself depends on how civilised international relations are. This is precisely how the 27th CPSU Congress has raised that issue, giving a clear-cut and unambiguous directive to the Soviet Union's foreign policy, i. e. "...to look for, find, and use even the smallest opportunity in order—while this is still possible—to reverse the trend towards an escalation of the threat of war". The Congress's call for replacing the old arrangement in which the world has become a hostage to nuclear death with an all-embracing system of international security is characterised by being aimed at really tangible measures, at close and fruitful cooperation with the governments and public movements which is really concerned about the fate of the planet.

What are, then, the main parameters of the new concept? They hinge on its underlying postulate reflecting the fundamental realities of today, namely that, given the present-day level of sophistication of the means of annihilation, our planet has become much too small and fragile for wars and a policy of strength. It cannot be saved and preserved if the political practice built up over the centuries on the acceptability and permissibility of wars and armed conflicts and on a longing for military superiority are not shed resolutely and irrevocably.

Hence, the following:

first, no state can any longer cherish the illusion of safeguarding itself solely with military and technical means, even by building up the most powerful defence, be it on land or in outer space. The task of ensuring security is increasingly seen as a political problem, and it can only be resolved by political means;

second, ensuring security requires that the accumulation of the means of annihilation should be stopped. It is no longer possible to win the arms race or a nuclear war itself, and objectively they can bring political benefits to no one. Continuation of such a race and, even more so, its spreading to outer space will only step up even further the pace, rapid as it is, of piling up and improving nuclear weapons. The situation in the world can become such that it would no longer depend on the reason and will of politicians and would be taken hostage of technology and the military and technocratic logic;

third, no single country can oppose its national security to international security. Those two concepts have become organically interrelated and indissolubly linked. As has been stated in the well-known report of the Palme Commission—and we cannot but pay tribute to the memory of Olof Palme—the countries should realise that in the nuclear age states cannot ensure their security at the expense of each other. Only joint efforts and the policy of mutual restraint by the states can enable the people throughout the world to live without fear of war and destruction, to live with hopes of a safe future and prosperity for their children and for coming generations.

The global character of the threat which equally calls into question the life of the peoples throughout the planet demands that they all should feel themselves to be in equal security. In other words, security must be equal for all.

As to the Soviet Union, it has been stated with all responsibility at the 27th CPSU Congress that "in the context of the relations between the USSR and USA, security can only be mutual, and if we take international relations as a whole it can only be universal". This country lays no claim to more security but it will not settle for less.

The Soviet Union sees its ideal in a world without weapons and violence, a world in which each people would live in equitable and safe conditions and freely determine its fate. The comprehensive system of international security is called upon to ensure such a world. Basic foundations of such a system should be laid down in the military, political, economic and humanitarian fields.

As to the essence of those foundations, it consists in unconditional renunciation of war and the threat or use of force as a means of solving interstate political, economic, ideological and other contradictions, including confrontation between the two opposing social systems—socialism and capitalism. In point of fact, this is a question of consolidating everywhere in international relations the principle of peaceful coexistence as a generally recognised and universally observed norm, which has already been dealt with above.

The comprehensive system of international security, as we contemplate it, is not merely the absence of war but also the incontestable right of

every people sovereignly to choose ways and forms of their development, a just political settlement of international crises, confidence-building, and effective methods of preventing international terrorism. This also means development of broad long-term and stable ties in the spheres of economy, science and technology on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, renunciation of any forms of discrimination and pressure, and economic security of states. This means mutual exchange of genuine cultural values, expansion—while respecting the laws of each country—of international cooperation in the implementation of the political, social and personal rights of people. This means cooperation in solving the global problems of environmental protection, in searching for new sources of energy, raw materials, food, in the peaceful exploration of outer space and the riches of the World Ocean, and in overcoming economic backwardness, famine and diseases. It is obvious that the attainment of all the above goals will be substantially facilitated if an end is put to the squandering of manpower and funds on the arms race.

The advancement to a universal peace can apparently be ensured by establishing reliable security guarantees in all spheres of international relations. A set of such guarantees would determine the structure of the system as proposed by the Soviet Union.

It is our firm conviction that the main support of the entire edifice of security should be direct guarantees that weapons would not be resorted to and would not wipe the human race off the face of the Earth. And the most reliable way to ensure that is to eliminate weapons themselves. In other words, disarmament that erects a physical barrier to wars is the most important guarantee of and the basis for a safe world.

In the first place, it is essential that the foundation of the common house of humanity contains no explosives capable of blowing the whole planet to smithereens. Security cannot be built endlessly on fear of retaliation, i. e. on the doctrines of "containment" or "deterrence". They are intrinsically aimed at whipping up the arms race and heightening the risk of nuclear war because, if one were to follow their logic, each country should seek security in creating and aggravating the threat of launching a nuclear strike. Hence, the more weapons and the greater their destructive power, the more reliable is security. Thus, apart from the absurdity and amorality of a situation in which the whole world becomes a nuclear hostage, those doctrines encourage an arms race that may sooner or later go out of control.

As is borne out by the entire record of the post-war period, that race, if continued, cannot but increase equal danger. As to its spreading to outer space, this will only step up the pace, critically high as it is, of accumulating and improving nuclear arms.

According to a majority of scientists in virtually all countries of the world, a way out of the existing situation cannot be found in developing and deploying weapons in outer space, which is what the USA intends to do with the assistance of some of its allies. While making the adventurous quarters believe in their impunity from retaliation should they be the first to launch a nuclear strike, those moves would erode the factors of military and political containment. The risk of nuclear war would also be further increased as a result of a technical malfunction, and the time and possibilities for taking political decisions in the event of a crisis would be cut down to the minimum. Such space weapons would directly supplement the offensive nuclear potentials, and with the passage of time, as they continue to develop and improve, they themselves would acquire a capability of launching a first strike against the targets in outer space or in the atmosphere or on the Earth.

There is only one direct and reliable road leading to ensuring international security in the nuclear and space age, i. e. nuclear disarmament and prevention of the introduction of arms in outer space.

Guided by all that, the Soviet Union put forward on January 15, 1986, a programme of comprehensive security through disarmament whose centrepiece is the phased elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere and for all time with an effective ban on space-strike arms. Concurrently with banning nuclear weapons, the USSR proposes totally to eliminate chemical arms. In the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces, it is also prepared to advance so far as other states would be ready to go.

All the disarmament measures proposed by the Soviet Union provide for verification, including wherever necessary, on-site inspections. The USSR is open to verification; we are interested in it not less than others and consider it a major element of the disarmament process. That verification should be sufficient to ensure that all sides comply with the agreements reached.

If implemented, the Soviet programme for complete nuclear disarmament would open up for humankind a prospect of entering the third millennium, focusing mainly on creative plans and placing the atom and outer space at the service of only peaceful purposes. In practical terms, the Soviet Union has proposed to the states a programme of star peace, i. e. their large-scale cooperation in the exploration and exploitation of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes and to the benefit of all the peoples, as a reasonable and realistic alternative to the new twist in the arms race spiral triggered by "star wars" preparations. We propose forthwith to set about implementing major projects of such cooperation, including joint development of advanced space technology in the interests of science, production, and economic development. In that we see a promising area for accelerating scientific and technological progress and a possibility for loading advanced industries and for effective investment. The Soviet Union regards that as a humane and highly moral task reflecting the moral values of our society.

What is the morale of those who do not wish to bid farewell to nuclear arms, viewing them as a means of intimidation, those who intend to supplement those arsenals with "star wars" weaponry? Those, so to say, moralists will have, willingly or unwillingly, to answer the question whether they are ready at all to bid farewell to nuclear arms. Or can they not see a world without new Hiroshimas and Nagasakis?

The process of arms limitation and disarmament is of crucial significance for developing all other direct and indirect security guarantees as well. According to the UN study on the relationship between disarmament and international security, the advancement towards disarmament will strengthen international security by creating conditions which would permit UN member states to take various steps for reduction of tensions, peaceful settlement of disputes and joint actions aimed at preventing the outbreak of war. UN experts have reached a conclusion that disarmament is the principal and most important factor in consolidating international security.

It would be even less permissible for the implementation of disarmament measures to hinge on the attenuation of regional conflicts. This hides both reluctance to go along the road of disarmament and the desire to use weapons and armed force with regard to other countries and peoples. The Soviet Union has opposed and will continue to oppose such a position. It has been and will remain a steadfast champion of the freedom of the peoples, stronger international law and order, and elimination of regional conflicts by collective efforts on an equitable basis, the sooner

the better. It goes without saying that that would, in turn, facilitate progress in arms limitation and reduction. We are ready to move concurrently along all these lines.

An essentially similar dialectical link also exists between confidence-building and disarmament. There is a thesis which is known to have currency in the West, namely that the peoples do not trust each other not because they are armed. But they are armed because they do not trust one another. Yet, a contrary can also be stated with full confidence, namely that the peoples and states lack confidence in each other because they are armed. In reality, both assertions are true. The question is what one wishes to prove. And it is an answer to that question that shows that the thesis played up in the West is a werewolf. It is called upon to justify the vicious circle which can be followed *ad infinitum*, which is exactly how, properly speaking, international relations have been developing over many a decade: the arms race—stronger confrontation—the arms race. To look for justification for that vicious circle means not to wish to find a way out of the current extremely dangerous situation and to drive international relations into ever further deadlocks. In evidence here is a typical example of the old way of thinking with its merciless exploitation of mistrust, suspicion and enmity which should be relegated to the past if mankind takes care about its own future.

New thinking calls for a search for indirect guarantees which would create conditions making it extremely difficult or simply inconceivable for a state to use force against another state. Here, it is necessary to follow the road of strengthening the climate of confidence which constitutes both a prerequisite for, and a major component part of, the establishment of universal security. What is needed are both large-scale foreign policy actions of states and efforts at changing the moral and psychological atmosphere in society in order to educate the population in the spirit of peace, tolerance and mutual respect and to introduce everywhere political psychology that would make the germination of militarism and hatred to other peoples impossible. In a word, what is required is an overall restructuring of the entire system of value orientations of the states in the international arena, the restructuring in line with the revolutionary advances occurring in the scientific and technological sphere. The main thing there would be to acknowledge the incontestable reality of today, namely that no single people and no single country can survive without efficient disarmament leading to security for each of them in particular and all of them together.

The establishment of a comprehensive system of international security is not only a multifaceted but global task calling for concerted action by the states and the peoples. For it to be fulfilled, all international forums should be set in march and the efficiency of the arms limitation and reduction negotiating mechanism should be increased to the utmost. An important role should be played by the systematic dialogue among the leaders of all countries of the world community, both on a bilateral and a multilateral level.

A particular responsibility for the world situation rests with the permanent members of the Security Council, which are nuclear powers at that. It is those powers that should demonstrate a political will and to undertake specific actions to put an end to material preparations for a nuclear war and to ensure a stage-by-stage reduction of the nuclear potentials down to zero. This is the underlying motivation for the Soviet proposal to the leaders of the five nuclear powers to meet together at the negotiating table.

The Soviet Union has taken vigorous efforts in a bid to impart a new impetus to the Soviet-US talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva,

the Conference on Disarmament, the Stockholm Conference, and the Vienna talks, whose aim is to curtail the arms race and to build confidence among states. We are convinced that in this approach to negotiations just like to international affairs as a whole, firmness in advocating the principles and interests of universal security should be combined with tactical flexibility, readiness for mutually acceptable compromises, and a search for a mutually acceptable balance of interests. What is needed is to aim not at confrontation but at dialogue and mutual understanding.

It is all too clear that universal security and the revival of detente as an inevitable and necessary stage along the road to that security are possible only as a result of political interaction among states, constructive interaction based on realism, a sense of responsibility in conducting international affairs, and new political thinking. In order to survive, we all should learn to live in a civilised manner, to work vigorously, boldly and jointly to create a comprehensive system of international security.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", 1986

English translation copyright: Progress Publishers 1986

/9274

CSO: 5200/1526

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU POLITBURO DISCUSSES ASIAN SECURITY ISSUES

LD151859 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Aug 86

[Excerpts] In the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee:

At its latest sitting, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed Comrade Gorbachev's report on the results of his trip to the Far East. Fully approving these results, the Politburo noted the importance of the major issues in the economic and social development of the Far Eastern region that were raised during the trip, and of the detailed conception of the strengthening of peace and security in Asia and the Pacific Ocean basin put forward by the Soviet Union. The speeches delivered during the trip by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his meetings and conversations with working people, are of fundamental political significance and serve as a new incentive for the restructuring of the entire life of Soviet society on the basis of the decisions of the 27th Congress and for further raising the working people's labor and social activity.

At the Politburo meeting, special attention was devoted to practical steps for implementing the initiatives put forward in Vladivostok with the aim of ensuring peace and security, of deepening cooperation with the socialist countries on the Asian continent and with India, of settling the situation in Afghanistan, and of developing mutually beneficial relations with the states in the Asia-Pacific Ocean region.

The results of the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Truong Chinh, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, president of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Council of State, were approved. The Politburo expressed satisfaction at the consistent strengthening and development of the fraternal friendship and fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and Vietnam, and at the unity of positions of our parties and states on issues of the further extension of Soviet-Vietnamese relations and improving the situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Politburo approved the results of the conversation between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Batmonh, MPRP Central Committee general secretary and chairman of the MPR People's Great Hural Presidium. A high evaluation of the comprehensive cooperation between the USSR and Mongolia was expressed and the importance of a steady improvement in the efficiency of bilateral economic relations and active cooperation in the interests of lasting peace and good-neighborliness in Asia was emphasized.

The results of talks between a CPSU delegation and a delegation of the Japanese Communist Party led by Fuwa, chairman of the Japanese Communist Party Central Committee Presidium, were approved. These constitute a fresh, important step on the path of implementing the joint statement by the CPSU and the JCP adopted in December 1984, and are evidence of the further development of links and cooperation between the two parties, first and foremost in the struggle against the threat of nuclear war and for the complete banning and elimination of nuclear weapons.

Having heard a report by Comrade Ryzhkov on the talks held in Moscow with Premier Ozal of the Turkish Republic, the Politburo noted that those talks had broadened the prospects for a further development of mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and Turkey in trade, economic, cultural, and other spheres and for the continuation of dialogue with the aim of strengthening good-neighborliness and mutual understanding between our countries in the interests of peace in Europe and the entire world.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo also discussed certain other issues of social and economic construction and the development of links with foreign countries.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW: ASIAN SECURITY, SOUTH PACIFIC NFZ

PM191437 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[Vladimir Mikhaylov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] "I was surprised when I read PRAVDA... I discovered that your country lives, works, and throbs with vitality." This discovery was made by Angela Roys, a schoolgirl in the senior grade at a high school in West Palm Beach in the American state of Florida. And she wrote to PRAVDA together with her classmates. We published the letters from America this week. After all, they, too, are evidence of the breaking down of artificial barriers, the first upshoots of the new way of thinking which rejects hostility and war and asserts peace and good-neighborliheess. The last 7 days have been full of the clash between these two trends.

Factor for Cooperation

As a contribution to International Peace Year, the Soviet Union, together with a group of other socialist states, this week submitted a new proposal of value to the whole planet. It is proposed to examine at the 41st session of the UN General Assembly, that supreme world forum, the question of "The Establishment of a Comprehensive System of International Security."

Profound concern prompted the taking of this step. Mankind faces a historic choice: to permit the slide toward the abyss of nuclear self-destruction, or to rebuild international relations on the basis of cooperation and collaboration in the cause of preserving peace.

The United Nations has already done much to mold a new way of thinking and a way of acting appropriate to the nuclear and space age and to overcome the extremely dangerous ideas about the permissibility of wars and armed conflicts. But the present alarming situation in the world requires energetic new efforts. The Helsinki process of dialogue, talks, and agreements has been in operation in Europe -- however poorly or well -- for over a decade now. This experience could be taken into account in elaborating the basic principles of international security for the whole earth. These must cover the military and political spheres as well as the economic and humanitarian spheres. The United Nations could take up the challenge of the times and respond by drawing up a fundamental document.

The main problem facing the human race today -- the problem of survival -- is equally acute and urgent for Europe, Africa, America, and Asia. But it looks different in each part of the world. The USSR's proposals on bringing Asia and Oceania into a comprehensive system of international security take full account of the peculiarities of that region. They are directed toward uncovering its vast potential for progress. And now, 3 weeks on, when the first wave of reaction has swept the world, we can say that the Soviet program for Asia and the Pacific has a great future.

Bilateral relations have a great part to play in bringing that future closer. This week Moscow saw Soviet-Vietnamese and Soviet-Mongolian friendly meetings at the highest level. What characterized them? The desire to increase the effectiveness of the fraternal countries' cooperation in resolving complex domestic and foreign tasks.

Socialism is an essential factor in the impressive, difficult changes in the Asian-Pacific region. The processes taking place here do much to determine the future of the world in general. That is why paramount significance is attached to the further strengthening of the socialist countries' unity and cohesion and their increasingly active cooperation in the elaboration and implementation of a coordinated course of eliminating the threat of nuclear war and strengthening universal peace.

The meetings in the Kremlin placed a high value on the new Soviet initiatives, as being in accordance with the interests of consolidating the security of Asian and Pacific countries and limiting and reducing arms, above all nuclear arms. As the Mongolian leader stated, Mongolia's proposal on creating a machinery excluding the use of force in relations between states of the region, a proposal which was confirmed by the 19th MPRP Congress, is consonant with these ideas.

The Vietnamese leader noted that the holding of an Asian-Pacific conference with the participation of all interested states would be a weighty contribution to tackling this task. The two states -- the USSR and the SRV -- are, together with Laos and Cambodia, actively advocating turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation. The Soviet Union and Vietnam reaffirmed their readiness to normalize relations with China, which would be of great significance for improving the situation in the Asian-Pacific region and strengthening universal peace.

A Soviet-Japanese party meeting at the highest level was held in Moscow this week. It summed up the results of the implementation of the December 1984 joint statement by the Japanese Communist Party and the CPSU on active cooperation in the struggle to prevent nuclear war and bring about the complete banning and elimination of nuclear weapons. Events in the world arena have reaffirmed the relevance and viability of this document. The two parties will continue to develop and extend their cooperation for the sake of achieving the goals it sets, goals of vital importance to all mankind.

The friendly relations between the CPSU and the Japanese Communist Party, as they develop further, are becoming increasingly meaningful and constructive. Our parties, like all the fraternal parties, are autonomous, independent, and equal. But, as national forces expressing their peoples' interests, they are also forces of an international nature. The course of events in the world itself and the vital necessity for the struggle to prevent a new world war give rise to the need to step up cooperation between communists in different countries. Differences in the conditions in which they operate and the divergences which exist on particular issues must in no way hamper this.

After Suva

A nuclear-free Northern Europe, Balkans, South America, Korean Peninsula, and Southeast Asia. The transformation of the Baltic, the Mediterranean, and the Indian Ocean into zones of peace. The idea of exiling weapons of mass destruction in the South Pacific is forging itself a path more and more confidently.

It is a question of the vast expanses from the equator to the Antarctic and from Australia to South America. When the creation of a nuclear-free zone here is completed and it joins on to the South American zone on one side and the Indian Ocean on the other, there will be a whole nuclear-free belt embracing a large part of our planet's Southern Hemisphere.

Work was carried out in this direction at the session of the South Pacific Forum in Suva, the capital of the island country of Fiji. At the previous meeting of the 13 states a year ago, a treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific was adopted. The Suva session discussed practical steps. Special documents were addressed to the United States, Britain, and France, calling on them to ensure compliance with the principles of the treaty in the territories in the Pacific which are under their control.

For those states, it was the moment of truth. London appeared to consent. But this was followed by an emphatic "but." The British government came out "in favor" only "on condition that the nuclear-free zone promotes security in the region"... Paris stated that it does not yet intend to stop its nuclear tests on the Pacific atolls. And the United States launched an outright offensive against the decisions adopted in Suva.

Washington decided to use Australia -- which is a party to the treaty on the nuclear-free zone -- as its Trojan horse. At talks held in San Francisco immediately after Suva, the United States undertook intensive attempts, first, to drag Australia even further into the sphere of its own military preparations, and, second, to use it to exert pressure on New Zealand to make it renounce its former decision not to allow any ships carrying nuclear weapons into its ports, even the ships of its ANZUS treaty ally, the United States. Washington is worried about the "danger" of New Zealand's example spreading, especially in view of the growth of the antiwar movement.

At the San Francisco meeting, as THE TIMES writes, "the United States tried to drive a wedge between Australia and New Zealand." But in the final communique the United States could only record that it is "suspending the fulfillment of its commitments in the security sphere vis-a-vis New Zealand under the ANZUS treaty." The Australian Government merely "expressed concern." Moreover, in the communique "the sides took note of recent events relating to the treaty on turning the South Pacific into a nuclear-free zone...." So what next? Will the United States respect the collective will of the governments and peoples of the region? Not a word about that.

Among the nuclear powers, only the Soviet Union expressed unconditional support. And at the meeting in Suva the participants assessed the USSR's appeal to other countries possessing weapons of mass destruction unilaterally or multilaterally to guarantee the nuclear-free status of the South Pacific. The strength of the Soviet program of peace proposals for Asia and Oceania -- as became obvious at the conference of 13 states in the capital of Fiji -- lies in its conformity with the peoples' desire to live without the threat of war, to live in conditions of freedom and true security.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW: NST, SDI, TEST BAN, ASIAN SECURITY, KOREAN NFZ

LD152345 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 15 Aug 86

["International Situation: Questions & Answers" program presented by Konstantin Patsyuk, commentator of All-Union Radio, with Tomas Kolesnichenko, member of the PRAVDA editorial Collegium and editor of its international news department; commentator Vitaliy Sobolev; Paris correspondent Oleg Maksimenko; Igor Surguchev; Sergey Pravdin, and (Yu.V. Vanin), head of a section of the Oriental Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Excerpts] [Patsyuk] Many letters which come in to us in the editorial office are from listeners who share their thoughts about the serious situation that has now developed in the world. They believe that saving our planet and human civilization from nuclear destruction to be the most important problem and the main object toward which the thoughts and efforts of all peace-loving forces should be directed.

Yegor Ilich Kulko, a listener from the village of Yarmolovo in Ryazan Oblast, writes that the peoples of our planet should live in peace. It is for this purpose that man is given wisdom, reason and conscience, to prevent the catastrophe that is looming over mankind. Peace, Comrade Kulko notes, should be eternal and universal. As is known, the USSR, and the other socialist countries and all progressive forces of the world are doing a great deal toward this. In the current situation, of particular importance is the matter of how relations will develop between the USSR and the United States and whether they will be able to agree on the basic, key international problems. Soviet-U.S. relations are increasingly exceeding the framework of relations between two countries. What do you think about this? I put this question to Tomas Anatolyevich Kolesnichenko, member of the PRAVDA editorial Collegium and editor of its international news department. Please:

[Kolesnichenko] In my view there are at least three circumstances involved here. In the first place, as two great powers possessing vast economic potential, multifaceted high level science and culture, they could, on the basis of their bilateral relations, by developing these links for mutual advantage, do a great deal for progress in the widest spheres. This would be to the advantage of both countries and to that of all mankind.

Second, as a result of, as they say, the realities that have come about, a historic competition has developed between us and the United States. The United States is a major capitalist country. We are the world's first socialist country. This says it all. We come out for peaceful coexistence between the two systems and we believe that history is irreversible and that it will lead to the triumph of the ideas of socialism and communism. The ideas of democracy and socialism are increasing winning over the masses throughout the world including Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The final circumstance, but perhaps the most important one, is that the international situation as a whole depends to a large extent on the state of Soviet-U.S. relations. Both states have accumulated such a nuclear potential that they are able to destroy not only each other, but a nuclear catastrophe could result in the death of all of human civilization and even life on earth. Therefore, the question of confrontation or cooperation between the USSR and the United States is, so to say, not an internal question. It is of concern to millions of people in the world.

[Patsyuk] Many comrades correctly stress in their letters that the state of affairs with regard to disarmament depends on the nature of Soviet-U.S. relations. In other words, without detente or constructive dialogue between the USSR and the United States, disarmament is impossible and therefore it is impossible to stop mankind from sliding toward nuclear catastrophe. Tomas Anatolyevich, what do you think?

[Kolesnichenko] Yes, this is so. The central and basic problem of Soviet-U.S. relations is the problem of security and the heart of this problem is disarmament and ceasing the nuclear arms race. In Geneva, for example, the subject and aim of Soviet-U.S. talks were defined as being to prevent an arms race in space and to stop the arms race on earth. Of late, our country has come out with a whole range of major foreign policy initiatives. We put forward for the peoples' judgment a program for the total and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the creation of an all-embracing security system, the elimination of medium-range weapons in Europe, and strengthening trust and peace in Asia. What is particularly important is that this is an integral program of actions and inter-connected measures. It concerns the survival of all mankind, yes, all mankind, not divided by continent into America, Europe and so on. Moreover, we are not just making proposals. We are setting an example and taking concrete steps which, if the United States joins in, will open the way to real disarmament.

Take, for example, the unilateral Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions which we introduced on 6 August of last year. It is difficult to exaggerate its importance. If there is no testing there will be no modernization of nuclear weapons and no creation of more and more new systems of mass destruction. Once this is achieved it will be easy to begin the reverse process toward eliminating them.

The problem is that the talks process and whole complex of relations with the United States is, as the Americans themselves, say, not a one-way street, it is a reciprocal and mutual process. As yet, however, no reciprocal movement has been visible on Washington's part. Recently, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's June letter to President Reagan put forward major new compromise proposals. Reagan sent a reply. Judging by what is being written about it in the United States itself, I personally am obliged to draw the conclusion that the White House has not gone halfway to meet these reasonable proposals and has not budged from its previous positions.

[Patsyuk] Why is the United States being so stubborn? Why does it not want to facilitate disarmament and why does it not go halfway to meet our proposals? This question is being asked by many people; in particular by Comrade Zhilkin from the village of Srednerashkovets, Kursk Oblast. How is Washington's position to be explained?

[Kolesnichenko] There is no simple answer. There are many facts involved. In order to solve this knotty problem one must examine a whole complex of issues, perhaps including the problem of the cult of strength in U.S. history, the U.S. way of life, economy, philosophy and even the administration's internal relations which have been of some importance. If one is to speak about the main points, however, then I would pick out the following aspects: I will start off from the fact that never before in the history of the United States has there been an administration at the helm which so openly and fervently preached anti-communism.

Both Reagan, who used to be governor of California, and his close associates who moved from that state to the White House continue to view the world from that same, to be blunt, provincial level.

These latter-day crusaders see some sort of satanic evil empire, that is our country, which sticks in the throat of America, virtually God's chosen country. According to Washington's logic all evil stems from the USSR. And, of course, its peace initiatives are, they say, all things of the devil. They are advantageous only to the USSR and contrary to the interests of the United States.

Judge for yourself. During the time that the present administration has been in power, and that is now 6 years, not a single treaty and not a single agreement has been concluded with us the sphere of disarmament. Not a single one, while we have put forth a whole range of compromise proposals. In other words, Washington is making its stake on force, on achieving military superiority over the USSR. This, by the way, is the purpose of the star wars program. By relying on new technology, the United States dreams of surging ahead and of creating first-strike weapons.

If one digs deeper and inquires who benefits from this, then we see that, for example, behind the SDI -- star wars -- plans stand the monopolies. They have long been called dealers in death. They are the giants of the military-industrial complex -- Lockheed, Rockwell, Hughes and other similar military contractors to the Pentagon. For comparison I will cite an example. Over the entire period of the fifties the military-industrial complex received orders totalling \$228 billion. But today, in just 1 year, they receive more: \$300 billion. That, then, is the locomotive of the arms race. They are thinking of earning trillions from star wars.

[Patsyuk] Reagan, himself, and his assistants in the past few days have been very optimistically setting out the nature of the U.S. reply to the letter from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev that contained specific proposals about SDI: to freeze it at the research, laboratory level. Washington asserts that Reagan's reply was given in a constructive spirit. Is this so?

[Kolesnichenko] Well, I personally have not read Reagan's letter. I am sure that after a careful examination of it, our leadership will express its attitude to the White House's assessment. But if one is to judge from what is being written about Reagan's letter in the United States, itself -- and echoes of this have reached us -- then I personally would not call it constructive. As far as one can judge, Reagan is agreeing not to deploy [razvertyvat] the SDI program for 5 to 7 years. But it is clear even to nonspecialists that it is simply technically impossible to deploy this system earlier than that. So what concession is there in that? Where is the compromise? Reagan goes on to propose to virtually renounce the antimissile defense treaty, that is, to give the green light to the star wars program and to carry the arms race into space. I do not see any compromise here. This is still the same position as before, which puts the brake on Soviet-U.S. dialogue on solving the most important problems of the present day.

[Patsyuk] What is now the main thing in disarmament and in Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Kolesnichenko] I think that the main problem is that of ending nuclear tests. One can say that it is a universal one. If the United States follows the USSR's example and ends nuclear explosions then, let us say, that same star wars system will not be deployed even in the distant future. If this is so, then one will be able to reach accord on reducing nuclear arsenals, strengthen trust-building measures, and move on to eliminating nuclear weapons. To put it briefly, stopping tests is the link by which it is possible to pull along the whole chain of problems.

[Patsyuk] What are the prospects? Are there any hopes for success?

[Kolesnichenko] Here is what is encouraging today: The example of the Soviet moratorium was so effective that in the whole world, including the United States, there is a growing wave of indignation at Washington's continuation of nuclear tests. There has even been grumbling in the U.S. Congress; it even cut funds for SDI recently. As a result, the White House is now being forced to maneuver. It is now the task of all disarmament supporters to force it not just to talk of its readiness to meet our proposals half way, but to carry out this practical step.

[Vanin] Yes, the peaceful unification of the country is the cherished dream of the Korean people, but its realization is persistently prevented by U.S. ruling circles, for whom South Korea is an important military strategic base in the Far East. A major contingent of U.S. troops is situated there, about 1,000 nuclear weapons are concentrated there, and further extensions are planned in the arsenal of the means of mass destruction. The efforts of the Pentagon one of the largest and best equipped armies in Asia has been created in South Korea. In immediate proximity to the DPRK, provocative military maneuvers are held every year. This year, for example, more than 200,000 U.S. and South Korean servicemen participated in them. The Workers Party and the Government of the DPRK and all Korean people tirelessly struggle for the elimination of tension on the Korean peninsula and the peaceful unification of the country. The numerous initiatives by the DPRK are directed toward this, including the proposal to remove nuclear weapons and U.S. troops from South Korea, to turn the Korean peninsula into a zone of peace, a nonnuclear zone, to replace the truce agreement concluded more than 30 years ago with peace agreement, and to work out a nonaggression declaration between the North and South; and the recent proposal for a three-sided meeting of military leaders of the DPRK, South Korea, and U.S. Armed Forces in South Korea to discuss matters for normalizing the situation and lowering the level of confrontation. The United States and their South Korean partners reject these peace-loving initiatives, displaying the true value of their lofty phrases about their commitment to the idea of peaceful dialogue.

Our support for the DPRK's constructive course was expressed with renewed strength in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok, who outlined a detailed program to ensure peace and security in the Asian-Pacific Ocean region through common efforts. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted that there is a possibility not only to remove the dangerous tension on the Korean peninsula, but to begin movement in the direction of resolving the national problem of all the Korean people. If we proceed from real Korean interests, there are no reasonable reasons to evade the serious dialogue which the DPRK proposes. This speech also highly assessed the proposal to create a nonnuclear zone on the Korean peninsula. The Soviet program for peace and security in Asia was received with contentment by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW PRESS BRIEFING: TEST BAN, SALT, SDI, CW

LD272204 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1913 GMT 27 Aug 86

[Press conference on Soviet peace initiatives and Soviet-U.S. relations at USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center on 27 August chaired by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; with Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Valentin Falin, chairman of the board of APN; and Academician Vitaliy Goldanskiy, member of the Committee of Scientists in Struggle for Peace and Against Nuclear Threat and chief editor of KHIMIYA VYSOKIKH ENERGIY magazine -- recorded]

[Text] [Gerasimov] Comrades, ladies and gentlemen. Today's press conference is devoted to the theme: the new Soviet peace initiatives and Soviet-U.S. relations. Taking part in the press conference are Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, Academician and director of the Institute of the United States of America and Canada; Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the board of APN; and Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy, Academician and member of the Committee of Scientists in the Struggle for Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat and chief editor of the KHIMIYA VYSOKIKH ENERGIY magazine. Academician Arbatov will make some introductory remarks:

[Arbatov] I think the question might arise for those attending of why, indeed, 2 days after the last one, there is another press conference on a fairly similar theme. First of all it is because it is a very important theme. We are indeed at an historic crossroads, and whether we go along the path of reducing armaments and ensuring genuine security -- and in our day and age these concepts in practice amount to the same thing -- or whether we enter upon a period of a totally unrestricted arms race and genuine nuclear chaos, will depend on the decisions adopted in the very near future. The problem is a large and complex one and is very important, and undoubtedly it merits not only one, and not two, but indeed a host of press conferences, discussions, and a broad and open [otkrytyy] dialogue, because, however everything ends, I think it will be a shameful thing if a sorry end awaits us through misunderstandings and ignorance of what we could explain to each other on particular issues.

The second reason is that in our view Soviet policy has, in the United States and certain other Western countries, become the object of massive disinformation and fairly malicious distortions both on the part of governments and also, I must unfortunately say, on the part of the mass media. The latest Soviet proposals have even been running into a kind of conspiracy of silence. Just imagine for yourselves a mirror-image situation where the United States has not been conducting nuclear explosions for a year and is saying moreover that it is extending this great nuclear fast for a further half-year, and meanwhile the Soviet Union is continuing to explode one bomb after another and its mass information media are simply keeping silent about this. I can imagine what biblical wrath the U.S. press, television, and radio would be pouring upon us from day to day, and probably rightly so. Here we have a completely different situation.

In this regard there is silence and people are afraid to write about us and about what we are saying and doing. Altogether, all the signs are that the administration has seriously gotten at the mass information media and that now support for the administration's line, or at least nonposition to it, has become something like a test of loyalty. People are probably having to keep silent under the threat that they will be accused of anti-Americanism. By all accounts, when it comes to questions of security and foreign policy, the press and television there are kept on such short rations that it is difficult for them to say anything sensible.

I think that otherwise they would not seize so greedily on every word spoken by Mr Larry Speakes.

It is as if, at his innumerable briefings, he were serving up juicy, fresh steaks, and not naked bones that long ago were picked bare many times. Now a few words on the substance of the matter: It is becoming clearer all the time that the cessation of nuclear explosions is not a measure of secondary importance. It is not a political gesture, or even simply a symbol of goodwill. It is, rather, a major and highly important practical step -- I emphasize that -- a practical step toward stopping the nuclear arms race and abolishing the nuclear threat.

The fact is that the nuclear tests being carried out today have nothing to do with the deterrence with which they are constantly justified. They have nothing to do with the declarative doctrines to which loyalty is constantly being sworn in the United States. The quantity of already-tested nuclear weapons that has been stockpiled is such that if we reduce it not only two-fold, but threefold, fourfold, and fivefold, we would still have more than enough left for deterrence. If any doubts remained on this score, I think they must have been dispelled since the disaster at Chernobyl.

No: Tests are being carried out today, not in order to develop weapons of deterrence, but to develop weapons with which they intend to wage -- and hope to win -- a nuclear war, contrary to all the declarations that both these things are impossible. This has been said both verbally and in writing. In Geneva the U.S. President signed, during the summit meeting, a statement saying he agrees that nuclear war cannot be waged and that there will be no victors. That is really the only purpose of continuing the tests. All the other explanations, the difficulty of verification, the problem of reliability, or the supposed superiority of the Soviet Union, are entirely without foundation. Regarding all these problems, my colleagues and I are willing -- if it is of interest to the audience -- to give the appropriate answers, as well as answers to whatever other questions you may have.

[Gerasimov] Thank you, Gennadiy Arkadyevich. Now may we have your questions, please.

[Unidentified GDR correspondent] If the United States participates in the moratorium on nuclear explosions, what possibilities will this open up for improving relations between the Soviet Union and the United States?

[Falin] As you know, last November in Geneva, General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan of the United States acknowledged the need for concrete measures to improve Soviet-U.S. relations as part of the process of improving the world situation as a whole. It was agreed in this connection that efforts by both sides would be undertaking in the interests of stopping the arms race on earth and preventing an arms race in space. It was envisaged that at a meeting which it was intended -- and is still intended -- to hold in 1986, these joint and unilateral efforts would be reviewed so that we might consolidate the positive result and move on

from there. Speaking during his trip to the Far East, Mikhail Sergeyevich drew attention to the fact that there was no agreement to meet in any case, regardless of the situation and regardless of what the sides were doing, simply in order to get together. We see no point in meeting just for the sake of meeting.

Naturally, when it comes to solving problems, the state selects those where conditions are ripe, where the best prerequisites exist for asserting, not in words but in deeds, that which is positive and for the sake of which the efforts are being undertaken.

[Falin] Today the question of halting nuclear weapon tests is a technically and politically simple question. It is simple because for 1 year now the Soviet Union has not been conducting tests and simple because there is a need, first and foremost for goodwill on the part of the United States in order to resolve this question.

[Arbatov] I'd like to add a couple of words: Well, you see, it's good that the Moiseyev ensemble will travel to the United States. Americans, after a long break, will probably watch it with pleasure. An exchange has begun between scientists -- not without resistance from the American Government to begin with -- but now cooperation is somehow reviving, and all of this -- but behind such concrete, partial, and positive phenomena, we can't lose sight of the main issue: that on the main question, Soviet-American relations have not improved, but also that movement is continuing in a dangerous direction, in the direction of worsening relations. This concerns the arms race, this concerns regional conflicts, the behavior of the United States in the international arena -- this policy of globalism -- and if you like, even the rhetoric we hear from the United States, and it's difficult to imagine -- take a look at what still lies ahead this year: On the eve of the opening of the UN General Assembly they'll be sending Soviet employees at the UN Mission out of the United States. How America plans meetings -- I can't imagine how that can be. To tell the truth it ought to take place either a couple of weeks after America leaves the SALT treaty -- which its government promised -- or on the eve of that withdrawal? Well, what can one talk about in these conditions? An offensive is underway on all the conditions of even those modest limitations on the arms race -- which were created by already existing treaties -- in order to torpedo the very possibility of talks. This creates great difficulties, and therefore the moment is very important and I think that those certain positive factors that are to be found somewhere on the periphery of relations -- they are welcome and may there be more of them, but in no way can they take the place of this thing.

[Gerasimov] If the United States once again gets military activity underway, in Libya for example, what will the reaction of the USSR be and will the moratorium be halted? This question is asked by the first channel of FRG Television.

[Arbatov] Well you see, when at the time that first piratical act was carried out against Libya, we did not break off the moratorium. We cancelled the meeting between Shultz and Shevardnadze. I'm not going to start guessing about what will happen now. I hope all the same that it will not be repeated.

[Falin] I'd like to add that if we talk about the attitude of the Soviet side towards the concentration of American forces in the area of the Mediterranean and the pointed concentration against Libya, then naturally not one state that responsibly approaches the questions of peace and security can welcome such a development of events and cannot remain indifferent to it. We're talking about the latest military demonstration and a typical demonstration of force, a typical build-up of American efforts at sabre-rattling, which of course destabilizes the situation, not only in that region, but also in a wider sense.

[Unidentified correspondent] A question from Czechoslovak television. What, in your view, will be the reaction of the Soviet Union in the event that the United States of America stops observing the SALT II treaty?

[Arbatov] Well, you see, this will be a blow to all the conditions of the treaties. Strictly speaking, in America too many people understand that in direct terms this will be a greater loss even to the interests of the United States than to the Soviet Union.

In this treaty the main restrictions on the Americans were included in a 2-year protocol, which has long expired, and on us they are in the treaty itself, and are observed. So the direct result will be that we will have the opportunity of, very rapidly and at the cost of small expense, increasing our strategic forces, and I am not sure that the United States will be given anything. This forms the basis for the partial opposition in the United States to this step. The political consequences, however, will be very bad -- I don't see how one can talk about the United States wanting a reduction in nuclear weapons, starting with the liquidation of those modest restrictions that have already been set out for this. Of course, this will create difficulties for the whole dialogue and for all (?proposed) meetings.

[Falin] There are two sides to the question you are asking, what comes after the restrictions of SALT II expire, and the wider question, the political, legal, and so on. The well-known Kenneth Adelman, explaining the reason why the United States refused to ratify this treaty, SALT II, said that ratification of SALT II would have signified the transfer into the 1980's of those principles that were agreed into the basis of the process of strategic offensive weapons limitation. These principles, Adelman said, would have become a kind of law for the United States, which would not suit the present administration at all. So here, in essence, the question of the principles on which talks have to be conducted in the future as well is at the present stage the main one. Either the United States recognizes the principle of equality and equal security, or it does not recognize it. Either the United States considers international security to be something common to states, or it will, as they say, act proceeding from the requirements of only its own security, more precisely, proceed from its understanding of the requirements of its own security, and ignore the interests and requirements of other states. That is the fundamental question on which a response has to be given, and a precise answer.

[TASS reporter Vashedchenko] It was pointed out in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement that the Soviet Union will find a way of devaluing the Americans' so-called strategic initiative, and essentially the star wars program. How would you comment on this statement?

[Goldanskiy] I think that here one can say the following: There is some kind of level of stability through mutual deterrence, and currently the question of what that level should be and what is the level of sufficient offensive armament in order that this level might be maintained is the subject of talks. Now there arises the so-called shield, an umbrella that is supposed to be fully reliable, but in actual fact is a leaky umbrella, but we are not going to talk about that now.

If we look at the scenario in which the two sides have these umbrellas, that is, the two sides are developing anti-missile defense, one can demonstrate fairly easily and logically -- I'll not take up time for that now -- that as a result the level of stability is only reduced. If we are talking about countering an anti-missile defense with some kind of anti-ABM defense, then, again, on the basis of very simple logical thought, we can demonstrate that given this the level of stability would be in some way restored. In the next spiral that is, of course, undesirable and that we oppose. However, it would be restored at a much greater material expenditure for the side that implements the anti-missile defense than for the side that implements these retaliatory measures. So these are the circumstances I have in mind, that it is much cheaper and much more effective, even from the point of view of international security, to counter this very anti-missile defense, this star wars program, with methods that will effectively prevent, so to speak, hopes for this very missile defense, hopes that one side will be completely protected, and under this protection it will be able to make the first strike and do everything it likes.

In this connection I want to recall that at one time, if I am not mistaken, Weinberger was asked what would his reaction -- what would America's reaction be to a situation where the Soviet Union unilaterally created such an anti-missile defense system. Weinberger said that the United States could not allow this. In this instance the logic of our response is, in general, this: We, too, cannot allow this, but if one wants to be specific as to what technical measures would be envisaged in order to carry out such a neutralization, I would put it like that -- this anti-missile defense. First and foremost, it is clear that it is much easier when one is talking about the neutralization of targets, say, which are in a stationary orbit, than of targets, mobile missiles, and warheads. Among such measures one could name various kinds of space means that could, at some such time, be directed to neutralizing this anti-missile defense. And, I say again, this is a much cheaper way.

[Gerasimov] Thank you. I recall that U.S. General Omar Bradley once said that if for a missile you invent an anti-missile, then for an anti-missile you can invent an anti-anti-missile, and for an anti-anti-missile you can invent an anti-anti-anti-missile, then you will have an endless, wanton arms race, so it is better to call a halt.

[Arbatov] Generally speaking, in my opinion, apart from Reagan, hardly anybody in the United States believes in this shield. Everyone has view in his own mind -- various groups in the United States have different SDI's in mind. One of the most popular is the SDI as a means of economically undermining the Soviet Union. In this respect the vital element is the fact that we will not submit to this. They want this very much. A group of our scientists has just arrived from Erice and they say that the Americans from Livermore have simply been urging them: Look, let's build the SDI together. There are some people present here who have been to Erice. Let's build together. Come to our laboratories -- I, of course, am not sure whether they would let us if they did agree. But, why is this? Because they are calculating on undermining us economically, and therefore, we would like to say in advance that this will not happen. The Americans, by the way, are already undermining themselves, by this excessive military expenditure.

[Goldanskiy] That is essentially, what I have said, and in this instance I would like to develop a little the idea set out very precisely in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. "This idea is that the hopes of economic -- so to speak, of ruining our national economy by drawing us into this anti-missile defense race, these hopes are futile, because it is possible to find an effective counteraction to this ABM program, that is, essentially, to somehow, so to speak, go back to the level that currently exists, without any serious economic expenditure in the nature of the trillions of dollars that the United States is planning for this.

[Unidentified reporter from Soviet television's "Vremya" program] Judging from news coming in, the idea has emerged lately in the United States that somehow all the questions connected with the forthcoming Soviet-American summit have already been decided. For example, White House spokesman Speakes said recently in this context that if the meeting takes place, fine, but if it doesn't take place, then that's really not too bad, either. How would you comment on such a mood, and on such a statement?

[Aratov] You know, generally speaking, an attempt is being made -- I think Valentin Mikhaylovich already said as much -- to substitute for the main issue of the Geneva accord, that both sides committed themselves to take measures toward a normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations, an improvement in the international situation, and a speeding up of the process of the talks on arms limitation, to substitute for this the issue about the meeting, and to substitute the issue of the means for the issue of the end.

This, generally speaking, is a deliberate falsification, as is the falsification about the way things are today. As far as I understand, absolutely nothing has changed, and two decisive points still remain on this meeting that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about. The first is the political atmosphere and the second is that the meeting must yield results. The rest is all needless complication.

[Falin] The first comment I would like to make is about what Speakes said: It doesn't matter to us whether there is a meeting or not. And: If there is a meeting, fine, we'll get by if there isn't one. This shows the arrogance and conceit that is demonstrated in their statements of their positions by such representatives -- certain representatives, anyway -- of the American side. They might as well say: We don't care if there is a war or not; there can be tension, or the world can be a better place, we don't care. The American people will survive, so be it.

The second thing that must be said here is what is the reason, what is the central factor behind all that is not right with the world at the moment? What is the main reason for the burden that has been laid on the shoulders of mankind and on what does the future depend, even the question of the life of mankind? Too many weapons have been accumulated in the world, and if things proceed as certain leaders in Washington would like them to -- and that is that more and more weapons are accumulated, more and more refined weapons -- even today they are talking about the need to bring into the United States arsenals not just binary chemical weapons but also bacteriological weapons -- then the question as to when the catastrophe comes is not a question of whether it comes or doesn't come, but simply a question of when it will come.

Naturally, when we think about a Soviet-American meeting, and when our leadership poses this question, the main issues are at the center of attention. The main question is: What must be done to stop this crazy spiral and what must be done to finally begin to reduce the level of military confrontation so that those weapons systems that threaten the very life of mankind are banned and removed from the arsenals of states?

We believe -- and this has been stated more than once recently at the very highest level in our country -- that in practical terms the most urgent question is the question of ending nuclear tests. This is the question of ending the improvement of weapons, the question of ending work on giving these weapons the nature of conventional weapons that could be used in conventional military operations, including against nonnuclear countries, as we know arises from the charter of the U.S. Armed Forces. So that in this regard, nothing irreparable occurs. Deeds are necessary; enough words have already been said.

[Unidentified questioner] CZECHOSLOVAK TELEGRAPH AGENCY. One of the main U.S. arguments against an end to nuclear explosions is that they -- these explosions are necessary for the reliability of nuclear weapons. Comrade Arbatov has touched on this problem. I have this question: The Soviet Union has for over a year not conducted any nuclear tests. Does this problem worry you? Do you not have any fears for the Soviet Union's nuclear security?

[Goldanskiy] The main thing I would like to emphasize -- and Georgiy Arkadyevich has already mentioned this -- is the question as to whether nuclear weapons are seen as a means of waging war; that is, is it a question of testing for waging war or of testing to hold war in check?

A more than sufficient level of armament has therefore already been accumulated for the deterrence of war, and here there is no need for tests, so all the tests that are being done are tests directed toward waging war.

[Gerasimov] There is also a question from Mr Danilow representing U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT. Virtually every day the Soviet Union calls for the cessation of testing; virtually every day the United States says that it will not agree. So why insist so stubbornly on banning tests? Diplomacy is the art of the possible. Question: Do you believe that at the last minute the United States will soften its stance?

[Arbatov] You know, it very often happens in politics that things happen, things start, only when it is no longer possible to do nothing. And that is why we have to fight so stubbornly for each movement forward. yes, Mr Danilow, so far the Americans have not agreed to this, but if you recall what Reagan and his entourage said in 1980 and 1981 you will see that there have been movements in their positions, albeit cosmetically and pro forma. At that time they opposed all talks, they spoke about us only as the evil empire and, in general, there was no discussion of anything. I think the United States will change its position when it becomes clear to the leaders that it cannot be otherwise, that they cannot but change their position, that this will be the entire situation both in the country and in the alliance and in the world, in public opinion everywhere. I still believe that this force exists. You know, all the same, something is happening, these movements toward a new political way of thinking. I recall that recently I was discussing Chernobyl with one of my American friends, and he said to me: You know, completely new approaches are suggesting themselves. The most terrible thing that the Soviet Union could do to the United States is to detonate all of its nuclear warheads on its own territory. Then a rapid and painless death would befall you, and we Americans would have to die a prolonged death, in torment and nightmares. Yes, indeed, one aspect of this entirely new situation is that we are being drawn all the time to some kind of traditional, old, medieval -- or at least prenuclear -- approaches to problems. I hope this will not remain so for long; it is an unnatural situation. That is the detachment from reality that we can observe in U.S. policy today.

[Goldanskiy] I would like to add a couple of words here.

[Gerasimov] Please do.

[Goldanskiy] I would like to say, as the question happens to have been asked by an American, that there exists the term Doomsday Machine [preceding two words spoken in English] that is, the machine of judgment day...

[Arbatov, interrupting] What will they think of next?

[Goldanskiy] ... which has long been talked about. It is said that the immense stockpile of nuclear weapons accumulated by each of the sides at present guarantees -- more or less, so to speak -- that should one side decide to commit suicide, this would entail not only its suicide but the end of all on earth. It is therefore time to shout literally at the top of one's voice here about this circumstance.

[Falin] One should also add the point that has been made already, that the Americans are stubbornly continuing the line of drawing the Soviet Union into a race for the development [sozdaniye] of new weapons systems, and these systems are getting more and more expensive literally day by day. It is a way of waging war without using weapons, in effect.

It is a line the Americans have been essentially officially pursuing since 1947, when the requirement was defined of putting the Soviet system into such unfavorable external conditions in which this system would have to function under maximum external pressure.

[Unidentified correspondent] Czechoslovak radio. It is known that President Reagan's administration has not signed a single treaty with the Soviet Union on limiting the nuclear arms race. Are there any grounds to speak today of motives that would lead to a change in Washington's stance?

[Arbatov] I don't see any as yet. It seems to me that what can be discerned is something rather different. I won't venture to speak personally and personify that policy, but in American policy as a whole, what is discernible is something else: a desire to hurry up and destroy as much as possible by 1988, so that afterwards even the successors of the present administration will have a hard job restoring it. So they're undermining SALT, undermining the ABM Treaty, undermining... [sentence trails off]

[Gerasimov] It's not just undermining it. It's the bulldozer syndrome.

[Arbatov] yes, the bulldozer syndrome, as Gennadiy Ivanovich says. And you know, when you look at it, all the treaties are being [changes thought] by the Americans. The Americans are going against international law and against international organizations. Not without reason. It's the way of these people. They want to rid themselves of all restrictions, the people who dictate policy. I don't want to name them. I don't even know their names, and it's not important anyway. And it's all there: The Americans are obliged, for example, under two agreements, obliged to conduct -- they've undertaken an obligation, just as we have -- negotiations on a total ban on nuclear tests.

[Falin] Not just negotiate, but reach agreement.

[Arbatov] Yes, to strive -- to strive to achieve a total ending of nuclear tests. Whereas -- there's a resolution of the Senate, there's a resolution of the House of Representatives. But they have had no effect. Therefore it's difficult to understand this otherwise than as a sort of desperate attempt to smash up whatever they can so as to make it more difficult to effect that return to common sense that is dictated by the whole situation in the world today.

[Mikhnovich] Mikhnovich, APN. My question is this: The practice has grown in recent years of holding confidential talks between the USSR and the United States. Is this practice not conducive to precisely the conspiracy of silence that Academician Arbatov has been speaking of?

[Falin] International relations are too complex, they have too many layers and too many facets for us to be able to settle in advance on any one method of doing business. If at a particular stage confidential exchanges of views, correspondence and so on, help us to bring our positions closer together; if the American side finds this method more acceptable, for reasons of an internal nature, so as to adopt a more reasonable position, then, in the interests of solving the problems, it would naturally be absurd on our part to object to this way of doing things. So let us, I suggest, start from the premise that the Soviet side will certainly continue to use all methods and means in seeking to constructively solve the problems of Soviet-American relations and international problems generally, in the interests of greater stability and security in the world.

[Gerasimov] Well, we're already glancing at the clock, and here's a question from the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, for Academician Arbatov -- and it's about clocks: In your book, "Entering the Eighties" ["Vstupaya v Vosmidesyatiye"], you mentioned the symbolic clock on the cover of the journal "ATOMIC SCIENCE BULLETIN" ["BYULLETEN UCHENYKH ATOMSHCHIKOV"]. In 1980, the clock's hands were moved from 1151 to 1153; a year later, the clock showed the time as 1156. What time would you set the symbolic clock at today, after the extension of the Soviet moratorium?

[Arbatov] Well, I'd put it like this: I'd say that at present there are two hands grasping that knob by which the hands of the clock are moved -- one is trying to turn them back, turn the hand back, as far back as possible, and perhaps later even sweep this nuclear clock off the table altogether; while the other is stubbornly nudging it forward towards the fateful brink. We are hovering on that decisive borderline; and whose hand is the stronger is not just something that the future will show. I think it depends on us all: On the Europeans, and the Asians, and the Americans, and the Soviets -- all of us. It's our decision.

[Goldanskiy] As chess is so much in the news just now, I would add that we must all try to ensure that the flag doesn't fall. That's the main thing!

[Gerasimov] Valentin Makahylovich, what's your opinion?

[Falin] My opinion is that for a long time, the clock has been a symbol; now, it's become a reality. In a situation in which American first-strike weapons have been deployed, and missiles take 6 to 8 minutes to reach their target, 54 minutes already corresponds to a real arrangement of forces. We are living 6 minutes away from war. Indeed, if we assume and presuppose that the Americans were to begin to implement the SDI program, then mankind would be living 30 seconds away from war, when any short-circuit in the system that is called the Strategic Defense Initiative would entail irreversible consequences. Therefore, the issue of moving the clock-hand backward or of removing the clock from the table, as Academician Arbatov said, is a task for all of mankind, and it is an extremely pressing task, for the clock is ticking and it is counting out the time that you and I have.

[Gerasimov] The time for our press conference has elapsed. Until we meet again!

/9738

CS0: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: MORE ON MOSCOW WORLD SCIENTISTS' FORUM

Address by WFSW President

LD212150 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 21 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow, 21 Jul (TASS)--In the heightened international situation the scientific workers bear special responsibility for the [word indistinct] of peace, said international Lenin peace prize laureate Jean-Marie Legay, president of the World Federation of Scientific Workers. He delivered a report at the forum "Science, Technology and Peace" which opened in Moscow today.

Scientists; professional competence, said Professor Legay, is already being used in the struggle for disarmament. [word indistinct] over nuclear explosions is possible, which is proved by the readings of precise instruments and supersensitive methods. It has been scientifically proved that the plan of the balanced and gradual elimination of systems of mass destruction, and then conventional armaments, is feasible.

It is only in conditions of peace that science and technology can fully serve the good of mankind, said Jean-Marie Legay. Accomplishments of science are not always used reasonably for social progress. Owing to successes of selection, for instance, earth can feed all the people who inhabit it. But imperialists use food reserves for blackmail. Laser, one of the greatest discoveries of the century, is also used in inhuman aims. Laser underlines the U.S. notorious SDI program.

Actually, this is the fundamental life or death dispute, the scientist stressed.

22 July Session

PM301150 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Science Must Serve Peace"]

[Text] The responsibility of representatives of science for the fate of peace and their role in the struggle to eliminate international tension and the ending of the arms race are the topics at the center of attention at the scientific forum entitled "Science, Technology, and Peace," which continued its work in Moscow on 22 July.

The charged atmosphere of the discussions in the various forum commissions has reflected the deep concern felt at the dangerous development of events in the world and the growing threat of nuclear catastrophe.

Adventurist military doctrines based on the myth of a "Soviet threat," the militarization of science, the development of new kinds of weapons of mass destruction, and the threat of the nuclear arms race being transferred into outer space face scientists in all countries with an urgent task--the task of informing the public about these dangers in an objective and well-argued way and explaining their pernicious effect upon our civilization's civilization. Such was the opinion of participants discussing the problems posed by the new scale assumed by the arms race.

There was also lively discussion of questions concerning constructive action to stave off the threat of nuclear war. An end to the testing and production of all kinds of armaments and the repudiation of the first use of nuclear arms by all nuclear powers were cited as the principal measures necessary to reduce the danger of war. In this regard forum participants from various countries rated highly the unilateral commitment by the Soviet Union and the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

The participants in the commission examining the socioeconomic, ecological, and political consequences of the arms race pointed with alarm to the exacerbation of such global problems as environmental protection and the energy, raw materials, food, demographic, and other problems. The sharp decline in the standards and quality of life, disease, hunger, poverty, and the developing countries' impossible debts are the direct result of the senseless expenditure of resources and money on tools of destruction.

The title of the fourth commission's topic "Developing Science and Technology Exclusively in the Interests of Peace Is a Very Important Prerequisite for Mankind's Progress" suggests the way out of the prevailing crisis. The discussion participants expressed the firm conviction that in the nuclear age, which demands new thinking, regular contacts among scientists and their recognition of their common responsibility for saving life on earth are of great significance.

The range of opinions being expressed by representatives of various branches of science from the international forum's rostrum is broad. But in their desire to defend the rights of mankind they are as one. This was also reflected in the appeal to heads of state and government adopted by the forum participants. It speaks of the need to make vigorous efforts to reverse the dangerous course of events and halt the dangerous slide to world nuclear catastrophe. The appeal urges the U.S. Administration to immediately join the Soviet moratorium and start talks on completely banning nuclear explosions.

Documents Adopted; Forum Ends

PM311018 Moscow TRUD in Russian 24 Jul 86 p 3

[Report by I. Belov and M. Demichev: "Scientists' High Responsibility: The International Symposium 'Science, Technology, and Peace' Ended in Moscow Yesterday"]

[Text] For 3 days more than 250 of the most eminent scientists from all continents have been holding a businesslike, frank discussion of the most vital problems facing mankind. Primarily they were discussing questions of war and peace, which have been placed at the center of international life by the course of history itself and which, by their solution, will determine mankind's future. Science and technology must be developed for the sake of peace and progress--that was the main theme of the speeches of many of the forum's participants, belonging to the World Federation of Scientific Workers (WFSW).

Many of the representatives of scientific thought viewed the reception given by A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, for a large group of foreign and Soviet scientists as the Soviet Union's recognition of scientists' special responsibility for the destiny of mankind.

During the 2d day of the forum's work its participants laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

The international symposium's work was conducted in four commissions: "New scale and dangers of the arms race"; "constructive actions aimed at terminating the arms race and averting the threat of nuclear war"; "the socioeconomic, ecological, and political consequences of the arms race"; and "the development of science and technology exclusively in the interests of peace is the most important prerequisite of mankind's progress." Each commission adopted final documents based on the results of their work.

The new phase of the arms race, the first commission's final document says, could lead to the gravest consequences for all mankind, perhaps even catastrophic consequences. On the one hand, such an arms race would impose excessive new economic burdens on the whole world. And on the other hand, it would inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war.

The turning point in the struggle to eliminate the nuclear danger, the final document of the second commission says, would be the banning of all nuclear weapons tests. It was noted that the current Soviet moratorium on these tests offers scope for reaching agreement on their general banning. The commission urged the United States and the other nuclear powers to join in the moratorium, end all nuclear explosions without delay, and accept the USSR's proposal on the immediate opening of talks on the complete banning of nuclear weapons tests.

The final document of the third commission stresses that the buildup of military preparations is linked to a great extent to the aggravation of global problems: the food problem, the population problem, overcoming backwardness, and eliminating dangerous diseases. The arms race is hindering the peaceful development of space and the world's oceans and aggravating the raw material problem. The arms race is one of the main obstacles in the way of increasing expenditure on environmental protection.

The tragic discrepancy between the colossal potential of scientific and technical progress and mankind's ability to make rational use of that potential was revealed by Albert Einstein, the final document of the fourth commission notes. Now, when the unrestrained growth of the nuclear, chemical, biological, and conventional military arsenals has brought the world to the brink of global catastrophe and when the threat of the spread of the arms race to outer space has become quite real, this paradox has become more obvious than ever. Consequently the responsibility of the scientists of all countries for the fate of peace and their role in developing the new political thinking also increases sharply.

At atmosphere of constructive dialogue and complete mutual understanding surrounded a young scientists' roundtable discussion held within the framework of the international forum "Science, Technology, and Peace." The problem of the social and moral responsibility of young scientists for the destiny of mankind was the subject of an interested exchange of opinions for the 120 participants from 36 countries.

The participants in the roundtable discussion welcomed the idea of creating an WFSW standing committee on young scientists' problems. We believe, the final document that was adopted states, that the creation of organized conditions for broad and multilateral cooperation among young scientists, teachers, and engineering and technical workers will promote the pooling of the efforts of progressive young scientists and technicians in the interests of peace and progress and the education of new generations of scientific workers in the spirit of the federation's humanitarian principles and noble traditions.

The symposium's final plenary session was held yesterday afternoon. The four commissions' reports were submitted to it and the forum's final document--Appeal to the Scientists of the World--was adopted.

That document expresses scientists' profound concern at the danger of nuclear war. The participants in this representative international forum firmly demanded an end to the arms race, the prevention of the militarization of space, and the ending of all types of nuclear tests. They supported the banning of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction and expressed confidence that this proposal can be implemented both technically and politically. The symposium's participants also supported a considerable, rapid, and universal reduction in conventional armaments and armed forces.

Scientists, the appeal says, can and must influence public opinion and governments with the aim of achieving the necessary agreements on preventing nuclear war.

A press conference was arranged for Soviet and foreign journalists related to the results of the symposium's work.

The foreign scientists took part in a ceremonial meeting of the Soviet scientific community devoted to the 40th anniversary of the WFSW and the 30th anniversary of the journal WORLD OF SCIENCE (MIR NAUKI) and held in the Hall of the Columns of the House of the Unions at the end of the symposium's work. The participants heard reports from Professor J.M. Legay, president of the WFSW and winner of the International Lenin Prize "for the strengthening of peace among the peoples," and O.M. Nefedov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, deputy chairman of the WFSW Executive Council, and chief editor of the Russian edition of the journal MIR NAUKI.

The ceremonial meeting was also addressed by Professor (Du Kinge), (UNESCO); Academician N.N. Blokhin, president of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences; Academician K. Bratanov, WFSW vice president and chairman of the Bulgarian Scientific Workers Union; R.A. Papilov, chairman of the USSR Education, Higher School, and Scientific Institution Workers Union Central Committee; Professor T. Hirone, WFSW vice president; USSR cosmonaut Professor A.S. Yeliseyev, rector of Moscow's N.Ye. Bauman Higher Technical School; and Doctor N. Gupta of India, WFSW vice president.

Academician N.G. Basov, WFSW vice president, who chaired the meeting, announced that the WFSW had received greetings from the USSR Academy of Sciences, the All-Union Council of Scientific and Technical Societies, the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, the All-Union "Znaniya" Society, and other Soviet and foreign organizations.

A festival concert was given for the participants in the ceremonial meeting.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

CPSU'S ZIMYANIN ADDRESSES SOVIET PEACE COMMISSION

LD221759 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 22 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 22 TASS -- The Commission for Observing the International Year of Peace in the USSR held its meeting in the Kremlin on August 20. It considered the question of holding a peace lesson and functions of the International Day of Trade Union Actions for Peace in the USSR on September 1, 1986.

The session was chaired by Mikhail Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the commission. In his opening address, he said that the activity of Soviet public organizations on observing the International Year of Peace was taking place at a signal, extremely important period of history. The current year, the year of the 27th CPSU Congress, as filled with political and labour enthusiasm of the Soviet people in implementing the strategic programme of accelerating the country's social and economic development. The constructive work by the people was inseparably linked with the vigorous struggle for stronger peace, for averting the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

The CPSU and the Soviet state, in pursuing consistently a peaceful Leninist policy, advanced a number of major foreign policy initiatives this year, directed at ending the arms race on earth and preventing the militarization of outer space.

Of historic significance were the Soviet Union's proposals for eliminating all nuclear weapons around the world by the year 2000, advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his January 15, 1986, statement.

Gorbachev's August 18 announcement of the decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government to extend the unilateral nuclear test moratorium until January 1, 1986 confirmed again the party's and people's adherence to the cause of peace, and understanding of their lofty responsibility for the fate of human civilization. The statement found itself in the focus of attention all over the world. It was enthusiastically welcomed by the Soviet people, by all people of goodwill, political and public forces and broad sections of the world anti-war movement.

It was noted at the meeting that two large-scale actions -- the peace lesson held at all general education schools in the USSR and participation by Soviet working people in the International Day of Trade Union Actions for Peace -- are linked not only by the common date, September 1. They were described as active forms of mass participation of Soviet people in the campaign for peace, for averting the threat of nuclear war.

Thorough preparations for and holding of these actions would become a new contribution to implementing the programme of the International Year of Peace, which acquired a special meaning thanks to the advancement of large-scale peace initiatives by the Soviet Union.

The commission heard reports by Sergey Shcherbakov, Soviet education minister, Georgiy Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee, and Viktor Mironenko, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League, on preparations for the peace lesson, and a report by Aleksandr Subbotin, secretary of the All-Union Central Trade Union Council, on Soviet workers' participation in functions of the International Day of Trade Union Actions for Peace.

Roza Bazarova, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and foreign minister of Soviet Turkmenia, Vladimir Vinogradov, foreign minister of the Russian Federation, and Nikolay Neyland, deputy foreign minister of Soviet Latvia, took part in the debate on these issues.

The commission adopted a decision to recommend that the peace lesson at the country's educational establishments and functions of the International Day of Trade Union Actions for Peace, devoted to the International Year of Peace, focus attention on provisions contained in Gorbachev's August 18 statement. Taking into account the positive experience and considerable educational effect of the peace lesson and the international response it caused, the commission recommended that similar peace lessons be held at vocational, specialized secondary and higher educational establishments of the country.

In conclusion, Zimyanin said that the reports, heard at the commission's meeting, about new steps and initiatives advanced by the Soviet people in favour of peace inspired the confidence that all functions in the country and abroad, devoted to the International Year of Peace, all efforts by the peace-loving public would become an important integral part of the peoples' struggle for curbing the arms race, averting the threat of nuclear war, non-militarizing outer space, reviving detente and strengthening peace foundations and goodneighbour attitudes in present-day international relations.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET GENERAL SHABANON WRITES ON ARMS POLICIES

PM211429 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Aug 86 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Article by Army General V. Shabanov, USSR deputy defense minister, under the rubric "Combat Potential: Technical Equipment": "The Material Basis of Defense Might"]

[Text] The party's program instructions on defense policy elaborated by the 27th CPSU Congress embrace the whole range of current problems of Soviet military building and the reliable defense of the motherland and the gains of socialism. Among the measures being undertaken to this end, a very important place is assigned to measures aimed at ensuring that the Soviet Armed Forces' combat potential continues to comprise a firm alloy of military skill and a high level of technical equipment, ideological staunchness, organization, and discipline among personnel, and loyalty to patriotic and international duty.

Each of these components has its own qualitative features, and they are all developing and improving. The greatest dynamism is to be found in the changes taking place in the material and technical base and in the technical equipment of troops and naval forces. This has always been the case, but this natural law makes its presence felt particularly at the current stage of scientific and technical progress, which was and is the direct source of qualitative shifts in military affairs. It is quite obvious that the party's course of accelerating scientific and technical progress also objectively ensures, where necessary, the accelerated development of the material base of the country's defense capability and the combat might of its Armed Forces.

Everything done in our country in the sphere of military building and the development and improvement of the Armed Forces and their technical equipment is subordinated to defense goals and to ensuring the reliable protection of the Soviet people's peaceful labor and the gains of socialism. As was stressed at the 27th CPSU Congress, the thrust of Soviet military doctrine is unambiguously defensive. Our country is in favor of taking weapons of mass destruction out of circulation and confining military potential within the limits of reasonable sufficiency. But the nature and level of those limits continue to be defined by the positions and actions of the United States and its partners in the various blocs.

Through the fault of U.S. imperialist circles, the international situation remains complex. Imperialism's aggressiveness, far from falling, has increased. By virtue of its social nature, imperialism constantly generates an aggressive policy. In the hope of reversing the course of history, it follows the path of military adventures, which have already brought mankind to the brink of nuclear catastrophe more than once.

The aggressive U.S. militarist forces are the main strike force of world imperialism. Not only do they themselves actively engage in military preparations, they urge the European NATO countries to do the same. Militarism in the FRG is being revived and strengthened. Britain sharply stepped up its participation in NATO military preparations with the coming to power of the Conservative government. Japan's course of militarization of the country has also been stepped up.

The U.S. imperialists have set themselves the goal of wrecking the strategic parity which has grown up in the world arena, achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, and on this basis securing world domination.

In the course of the arms race, which is being modernized on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology, MX missiles with 10 nuclear warheads are being adopted. Work has been accelerated on development of the Midgetman ICBM, which is small in size and, according to the Pentagon's intentions, low in vulnerability, and of new long-range strategic cruise missiles. By 1990 it is planned to build 15 Ohio submarines, to be equipped with the new Trident-2 sea-based ICBM's. The supersonic B-1B strategic bomber capable of carrying up to 30 strategic cruise missiles with nuclear warheads is now entering the armory.

The U.S. Administration attaches great significance to the buildup of forward-based nuclear potential near the borders of the Warsaw Pact countries. To this end, American ballistic missiles and medium-range cruise missiles have been deployed in Western Europe since 1983.

The United States recently announced the start of development of hypersonic transatmospheric manned and unmanned aircraft capable of flying in the 50-150 km range of altitudes at speeds comparable with those of ICBM's.

Alongside the improvement of nuclear weapons in the United States and the other NATO countries, work is in progress on a broad front to develop high-accuracy guided weapons (missiles, shells, mines, torpedos, and so forth) and search-and-destroy and fire complexes with nonnuclear warheads. Traditional types of arms are being steadily improved: tanks, all types of artillery, infantry combat vehicles, front-line and army aircraft, surface ships and submarines, and arms for them.

The U.S. ruling circles' plans aimed at the militarization of outer space -- the so-called "star wars" program -- are a serious danger to the cause of peace and international security. This program is hypocritically described as defensive, but in fact it is one more type of offensive weapon designed to inflict strikes on targets in the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries.

Gambling on implementation of the SDI program, U.S. military-political circles hope it will force the Soviet Union to create systems to counter it, and that this expenditure will drain it economically, thwart the course of further improving the people's living standard, and retard the fulfillment of the social program. Speaking in Vladivostok, Comrade M.S. Gorbachev said: "We know exactly who continues to cherish the hope of the systematic, methodical destruction of the USSR and the socialist countries, making use of economic, moral, psychological, propagandist, political, and military means to that end. But we can say that this cause was doomed before and is hopeless today."

In the complex, tense international situation, our party and the Soviet state are doing everything to thwart imperialism's dangerous designs and cut short the arms race. They persistently, consistently pursue a Leninist, peace-loving foreign policy and put forward initiatives in the international arena which are aimed at lessening tension and eliminating the threat of nuclear war. These initiatives are well known. But how do the U.S. ruling circles respond to them? By refusing to stop nuclear tests. By rejecting existing accords on strategic arms. By refusing to leave space free from weapons. They gamble on strength, on the nuclear fist, on terrorist piracy, thereby undermining international security.

In these conditions the CPSU and the Soviet Government are forced to take the necessary and, frankly, obligatory measures to strengthen the country's defense capability and prevent military superiority on the part of the United States and the NATO bloc over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.

The CPSU will make every effort to ensure that the USSR Armed Forces are at a level which excludes strategic superiority on the part of the forces of imperialism, to improve in every way the Soviet state's defense capability, and to strengthen the combat collaboration among the armies of the fraternal socialist countries--the new edition of the CPSU Program defines extremely clearly our party's policy in the defense sphere.

One of the main components determining our Armed Forces' readiness and capacity to decisively rout any aggressor is, of course, their technical equipment, which forms the material basis of the combat might of the Soviet Army and Navy. Here our military-technical policy invariably accords with the defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine and is aimed at maintaining the strategic parity which has grown up in the world arena.

The flexibility of the socialist economy and its ability to restructure itself and develop in accordance with the developing situation enable us to adopt prompt measures to restore the strategic parity if it is violated by militarist circles. However, this does not mean that in our military-technical policy we follow in the wake of the probable enemy or copy its armaments. Our military experts, scientists, and designers have long since proved their ability to predict correctly the path of development of arms and to create their own highly effective weapons which yield nothing to the weapons of the probable enemy. The traditions of those who created the weapons of the Great Patriotic War, weapons which showed undoubted superiority over those of fascist Germany, are devoutly maintained in our design and production collectives. The CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th Party Congress notes that the Soviet Army and Navy have modern arms and hardware.

The chief component of our Armed Forces' combat might and the paramount factor in deterring aggression are the strategic nuclear forces, created in response to American's--the Strategic Missile Forces and the strategic forces of the Navy and Air Force, which are in constant readiness to immediately inflict a retaliatory strike. This triad of strategic nuclear forces has a highly efficient control system which has high survivability and is linked to modern means of warning of a missile attack. Their interaction robs the aggressor of the chance of making a surprise first missile strike against the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries, even with the Pershing-2 missiles deployed in Europe.

It must be stressed that the Soviet Union's strategic nuclear forces are strictly in accordance with the SALT I and SALT II agreements.

The general-purpose forces are also developing within the limits necessary for defense.

The Ground Forces form part of the united formation of our Armed Forces. Their traditional arms -- tanks, infantry combat vehicles, artillery systems, combat helicopters, and means of communication, reconnaissance, and control -- are being constantly improved on the basis of the need to maintain their effectiveness at a level to exclude the superiority of the probable enemy in such arms. The Ground Forces are also armed with operational-tactical missiles capable of hitting various enemy targets at a great depth.

The Air Force has risen to a qualitatively new level. Air units and formations are armed with multipurpose planes and helicopters with various bomb, gun, and missile arms of the "air-to-air," "air-to-ground," and "air-to-sea" classes. [paragraph continues]

The control systems for these missiles, created on the basis of modern radioelectronic and optical electronics, ensure the high probability of hitting land, sea, and air targets by means of accurately guiding the missiles to target.

NATO's aggressive strategy attaches great significance to making air attack. We are therefore forced to devote much attention to the air defense of the country's military, industrial, and administrative targets, troops, and naval forces. To resolve these tasks, the Air Defense Forces are armed with modern means of detection and destruction of air targets. The basis of the means of detection of air targets consists of radar stations operating in various ranges of radio waves and capable of detecting targets flying at extremely low and high altitudes in conditions of intensive enemy jamming. The main means of destruction in the Air Defense Forces are interceptor aircraft and multiple [mnogokanalnyy] anti-aircraft missile complexes.

The Navy has in its armory nuclear and diesel-powered submarines with an arsenal of missile and torpedo weapons, naval missile-carrying aircraft, and surface ships with mighty armaments, including anti-ship missiles. Naval formations and units are capable of carrying out operational tasks with a high degree of autonomy in sea and ocean theaters of military operations, both independently and in collaboration with other branches of the Armed Forces.

Great attention is devoted to equipping the Army and Navy with means of communication and control in all tactical, operational and strategic components. All types of communications are widely used, including space communications, which ensures the reliability and survivability of communications and control in the most diverse conditions of conducting combat operations.

The new edition of the CPSU Program says: "The Armed Forces... must display its vigilance and always be ready to stop imperialism's intrigues against the USSR and its allies."

Always be ready.... That is the main demand of the party and people to the Armed Forces. It is above all in combat readiness and the level of readiness that the combat potential of the Soviet Armed Forces is realized, including the potential inherent in their weapons and military hardware. Hardware and weapons do not bring victory by themselves. It is people who achieve victory in battle, people who have a perfect mastery of the weapons entrusted to them.

The process of realizing the potential inherent in modern arms in the form of high combat readiness proceeds along many avenues. One is the pace and quality of mastery of weapons and hardware.

The weapons being created at the country's defense enterprises today, particularly the new models, require from the officers and all personnel of the Armed Forces a contemporary approach, which takes the form of a particularly thorough, profound study. Unfortunately, these increased demands are still not always met everywhere by an appropriate level of organizational work on the part of commanders, staffs, and political organs, especially at the stage of preparation for the assimilation of new models. Yet here everything is important: prompt professional selection of specialists, the right psychological mood, the ability to see and correctly tackle new problems on the "man-machine" interface. Only given an appropriate moral and psychological mood, only thanks to staunch military labor, can the commander and his subordinates study and master weapons and hardware sufficiently quickly and well.

Mastery.... It is very important to have the right idea of what lies behind that word. What lies behind it is the ability to use weapons effectively in modern warfare, in any conditions, at any time of the year or day. And that is not all. Mastery means knowing how to take from combat hardware everything that is inherent in it, to work toward the maximum, not the minimum. After all, the winner in battle is whoever is the first to locate the target at extreme range and the first to open accurate fire on the target.

To achieve the maximum, it is necessary tirelessly to improve the system and organization of combat, special, and operational-tactical training and the methodology of the training and education of officer cadres and to strengthen discipline and military order in every way. Combat training, field exercises, flights, and voyages, the rehearsal of practical habits in conditions as close as possible to those of combat -- that is the main task, the main workshop for the unit commander, the subunit commander, and the political worker. Today the whole country is tackling the tasks of restructuring, which is the cause of each and every one of us, the tasks of acceleration and the problems of intensification. These tasks are also urgent for command, engineering, technical, and political cadres in the Army and Navy. The acceleration of the qualitative improvement of field, air, and sea training, the intensification of combat training, the improvement of the style of all work in line with the demands of the restructuring -- today there is no more important, responsible task for the officer: The interests of the reliable defense of the motherland demand it.

And the emphasis should not only be on the mastery of new hardware. It is necessary to know how to make the most fruitful use of all the models of weapons available, all the available hardware, everything that our Armed Forces have at their disposal, that the people have entrusted to them.

It must also certainly be taken into account that hardware and weapons are today very costly. The intensive, creative labor of the servicemen's fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters is invested in them. Therefore it is very important to safeguard them, to operate them correctly, strictly according to instructions, without breakdowns or accidents, and to use them economically in the course of exercises and day-to-day combat training. Here much depends on the ability of commanders and staffs to give thought to the planning of combat training and its material backup, field and sea exercises, and flights, and to use simulators effectively, so as not to waste the running life of motors, fuel, or energy.

Hardware and weapons are supplied to the troops by defense industry enterprises. In the course of operation in the units and on the ships, possibilities naturally emerge for improving the design and increasing reliability and accuracy. Here it is hard to overestimate the importance of the innovator servicemen, inventors, and rationalizers. They do much to improve the qualitative characteristics of combat hardware. But their contribution can and should be even greater.

Of course, what is crucial for the level of technical equipment are scientists and engineers working for defense and the defense industry. But let us also remember those who accept the hardware at the plants and hand it over to the troops -- the military representatives at defense enterprises. Their contribution to improving the qualitative characteristics of weapons could and should be weighty and significant. The way to this situation lies through greater exactingness.

Clearly there are many problems associated with military hardware and its mastery among the troops and in the fleets. But they should all be successfully resolved. A profound knowledge of the principles of operation of weapons, their combat potential and conditions of use, and their means of interaction with other types of weapons -- that is what Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, USSR defense minister, demands of military cadres. It is the demand of our regulations, whose fulfillment guarantees the successful conduct of hostilities with a technically strong enemy.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S CHAZOV WRITES ON PHYSICIANS' MOVEMENT

PM191515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Aug 86 Second Edition p 4

[Academician Ye. Chazov article: "Thinking in a New Way"]

[Text] Mankind is preparing to enter the 21st century, a century of which much is expected and which is interpreted differently by everyone. However, we all dream of a time when man's reason and the development of science and technology will ensure people peace, prosperity, health, and happiness.

When thinking about the future we often forget that man's happiness and his very life are threatened by more than 50,000 nuclear warheads which are constantly trained on all the inhabitants of the earth and that each day sees the appearance of 10 new nuclear warheads.

There has never before been anything like it in the history of our civilization. In former epochs even the greatest and most protracted wars did not threaten to destroy all mankind and life on earth itself. The emergence of nuclear weapons turned this dreadful fantasy into a potential reality. A multitude of scientific research, including findings presented to the United Nations, proves that the use of even a small part of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons would lead to the instant destruction of hundreds of millions of people and colossal destruction of production forces. The survivors would be condemned to a slow death, and the living would then envy the dead.

It is difficult to actually imagine "a million Hiroshimas," which is how scientists attempt to define in theory the yield of the nuclear weapons stockpiled today. It is difficult to grasp the figure of 2 billion casualties in a nuclear war. But when you see even a few people doomed to die from exposure to radiation and realize the impotence of medicine, you automatically think: Then what kind of horror would a nuclear war bring? And you want to bring to the bedside of those patients the statesmen and military men who champion nuclear "deterrence" and allow the possibility of a limited nuclear war, calculating on victory in it.

Six years ago, faithful to our Hippocratic oath and committed to protecting the health and life of our patients, we physicians united to tell the truth about nuclear weapons and the consequences of a nuclear war. The participants in the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement do not always concur on everything, but we are united by the main thing in the present-day world -- an awareness of the need to destroy nuclear weapons.

The indifference of many people to irresponsible statements justifying the nuclear arms race was bound to alarm physicians. It was essential to arouse people who were indifferent, to show them how the arms race threatens every inhabitant of the earth. That is how we understood our professional duty, since a doctor must tell a patient what threatens his health and life.

What has the physicians' movement achieved? We have helped dispel a fog of ignorance for millions of people. The scientific untenability and the danger of the concepts of "limited" or "protracted" nuclear wars and of the very idea of its being possible to win them have become much clearer.

We have been able to convince people that medicine will be unable to offer even minimal assistance to the millions of casualties. [paragraph continues]

In fact our experience of treating patients with burns, injuries, and radiation sickness indicates that providing such help to all victims during a nuclear war would require the involvement of 30 million doctors and 100 million intermediate-level [sredniy] medical personnel. That is unrealistic when you consider that today there are around 3.5 million doctors and 7.5 million intermediate-level medical personnel in the world, and, after all, many of them would themselves be casualties in the event of a nuclear war.

We have been able to inform people of our conviction that no ideological, political, or national disagreements can justify the sickness, suffering, and, finally, ecological upheavals which nuclear war would bring.

At the six congresses held by the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement we have put forward our own medical prescription for mankind's survival based on precise scientific data. That prescription comprises banning tests of nuclear weapons, their non-first-use and nonextension to outer space, and the limitation of nuclear armaments to the point of eliminating them all together.

Physicians are certain that the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons is a realistically achievable goal. The USSR has proposed a program to eliminate them by the year 2000. The existence of nuclear weapons is not an essential stage in the development of a thinking civilization. However, since appearing they have brought civilization to a delicate stage beyond which lies the threat of its self-destruction. This truth must be recognized by all responsible leaders.

It is quite obvious that the nuclear age requires new thinking and an appreciation of the fact that reliable security in today's interconnected world can be assured only by cutting armaments, reducing confrontation, developing trust and cooperation, and settling regional conflicts -- an appreciation of the fact that ensuring mankind's right to life is the supreme task of state policy today.

More than 30 years back A. Einstein said: "We need new ways of thinking if mankind is to survive." How true! New thinking does not mean searching for security by stockpiling more and more new weapons systems and forcing one's own way of doing things on others; new thinking means acknowledging states' interdependence, particularly in disarmament questions.

New thinking is exemplified by the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, and it is particularly manifest in the way that the moratorium has been repeatedly extended in the hope that the United States will follow suit. This action has changed the thinking of many people in the world.

New thinking is exemplified in the appeal made by R. MacNamara, P. Warnke, M. Bundy, G. Kennan, and G. Smith to the American Administration to renounce the first use of nuclear weapons.

New thinking is exemplified by the breaking of harmful stereotypes. My colleague, Professor B. Lowne, said when addressing the conference of the Physicians for Social Responsibility organization in Philadelphia in March: "Anti-Soviet sentiment is one of the main obstacles, if not the main obstacle to support for the nuclear disarmament movement in the United States.... I am convinced that we will not be successful until an objective assessment of the Soviet Union becomes the main item on the antinuclear movement's agenda."

Speaking of the need to destroy the prevailing stereotypical thinking, I cannot help but remember today Doctor P. White. Personal reasons perhaps also play a role here, since he was the first American I ever met and someone who changed my ideas about American doctors. It was exactly 30 years ago -- in 1956 when, after a long gap, a group of American doctors headed by P. White visited the USSR. He was devoid of prejudice. In his book entitled "My Life and Medicine" he wrote that he dreamed of "establishing fraternal relations among people in our seething world." His life and activity are an example of new thinking.

Not just physicians and scientists but other people too who do not suffer from political myopia appreciate that it is impossible to go on living in thrall to prevailing prejudices. No one will accuse the well-known American industrialist A. Hammer of commitment to the ideas of communism, but this is what he wrote in the preface to his biography compiled by B. (Considine): "In September 1922 I gave V.I. Lenin a small bronze monkey sitting on Darwin's book 'The Origin of Species' and examining a human skull. Lenin said that in our age, when the instruments of war are becoming increasingly destructive, civilization could be overtaken by catastrophe if mankind does not learn to live in peace. A day may come when a monkey will lift a human skull from the ground and wonder where it came from. I will always remember those sagacious words of Lenin's, foreseeing, as it were, the emergence of today's atomic weapons. They are a symbolic warning against playing with the fire that we know under the name of the arms race."

I receive many letters from Soviet and American citizens. The main theme of them is that the peoples of our countries must be on friendly terms with one another for the sake of preserving peace and our children's future.

M. (Shultbarg) from California writes: "I honestly do not believe that your children are taught to hate Americans. Rather I believe the contrary. As I already wrote you in my previous letter, my wife and I visited Russia and found the people warm and friendly, with as much interest in Americans as we have in Russians... I am sincerely in favor of everyone, including myself, doing everything to dispel needless misunderstanding between Russians and Americans."

What must be primarily done to achieve this? The physicians' movement has now placed the question of stopping nuclear tests at the center of its activity. Tests are the most important and at the same time the weakest link in the vicious circle of the nuclear arms race. Stopping them will interrupt the process of improving nuclear weapons, building new ones, and creating even more destabilizing systems. It will erect a barrier to nuclear weapons being placed in outer space.

The physicians' congress held in Cologne urged the United States to follow the Soviet Union's example and stop tests. A mutual and verifiable [kontroliruyemiy] moratorium on all nuclear explosions would make it possible to start moving back from the edge of the abyss.

New thinking means resolutely campaigning for the gigantic resources involved to be transferred from military to civil purposes. In today's world more than 11 million children die before the age of 1, more than 5 million of them perishing from diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, poliomyelitis, and tuberculosis. The cost of vaccinating all new-born babies in the world against these illnesses comes to \$260 million. By comparison, 1 nuclear submarine costs around \$1 billion. The United States is ready to throw trillions of dollars into shifting the arms race into outer space.

Physicians protest against this inhuman waste of resources. In place of a space-based strategic defense system they have proposed a space-based medical communications system which would help maintain life on earth. [paragraph continues]

The USSR and the United States, the WHO and UNICEF, the countries of East and West, medical centers and universities worldwide could create a satellite system for consultation by any doctor in any country in order to save human life. The reduction of political and military tension would make it possible for many important medical questions to be resolved jointly.

When in our practice as doctors we come across someone who is gravely ill, we devote all our energy and knowledge to saving him. Mankind today is afflicted by a grave ailment -- fear in the face of a real threat of nuclear war. If mankind is to be saved we must stir the people's consciousness, help them abandon mutual distrust, selfishness, and chauvinism, and convince them of the need to adopt a new approach to international affairs, to build a nuclear-free world, and to create an all-embracing system of lasting security through disarmament. The horizons of productive cooperation among all peoples, which is essential in our interconnected world, will then clear.

We physicians have always believed and continue to believe in human reason. And we are certain that reason will triumph.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

TASS CITES GANDHI STATEMENT ON DISARMAMENT

LD081020 Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] Ixtapa, 8 Aug (TASS)--Forty-one years ago, Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi stated at a meeting of Delhi Six, the atom bomb was first dropped. With the bomb came the technology for human annihilation. "The atom bomb has come to blast the world," said Jawahralal Nehru. "But no bomb has yet touched the minds of statesmen and men of authority."

The very existence of nuclear weapons spells doom. If they exist, they will be used--by design, by error, by accident, by malfunction. All life will cease to be. Once, statesmen spoke of wars to end all wars. We know wars do not end wars. The atom bomb came as the weapon to end all weapons. We know there can be no weapon to end all weapons. Now we are told of shields to deter, deflect and neutralize. But we know this cannot be.

Humanity has the right to hope, the right to a future. The basic obligation for nuclear disarmament, continued the Indian prime minister, rests on those that have nuclear weapons. But we the non-nuclear-weapon states have an equal stake. A nuclear war cannot be confined to the combatants. Its fall out will embrace all. Nuclear weapons make no distinction between the aggressive and the peaceful. It is, therefore our duty as non-nuclear-weapon states to exert unremitting pressure on the nuclear-weapon powers to negotiate and to disarm.

President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev declared, when they met in Geneva, that their objective was "to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth, ultimately to eliminate nuclear arms everywhere." A nuclear war can never be won, they said, and so it must never be fought. The last ten months have seen little actual progress toward this objective. The decision to continue the dialogue is welcome. The next meeting of the two leaders must result in specific and effective steps towards nuclear disarmament. Challenger and Chernobyl remind us of the fallibility of technology. Annihilation by error is no less total than annihilation by design. The only sure safeguard for survival is the dismantling of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and must be so branded. Our declaration has called for a binding international agreement which would outlaw every use of nuclear weapons. With the United States of America and the Soviet Union having jointly stated that their objective is the elimination of nuclear weapons, we look forward to their subscribing to such a binding obligation. A moratorium on nuclear testing, followed by a comprehensive ban, will be a far-reaching step in the right direction.

In response to our call, the Soviet Union unilaterally accepted a moratorium on nuclear tests and twice extended it. We commend them and deeply appreciate the earnestness they have shown. Unfortunately, nuclear testing continues. It is contended that a ban on tests is not feasible in the absence of a mechanism for verification which would inspire confidence. That is why our six nations have put forward a proposal to undertake the verification of a moratorium. Our geographic reach, technological competence and independence to bloc rivalries should command acceptance. While the nuclear dragons on the ground multiply, there are attempts to lodge them in outer space. Outer space is the common heritage of all mankind. We cannot acquiesce in its privatization, certainly not for the purpose of destroying the earth. Weapons in space would be an irreversible extension of the danger.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET MOVIE ON NUCLEAR WAR AFTERMATH

PM041103 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian on 26 July 1986 carries on page 4 a 1,500-word article by Yevg. Yeviusenko under the heading "Where the Letters to Nowhere Come From," reviewing the movie "Letters From a Dead Man" ["Pisma Mertvogo Cheloveka"], directed by K. Lopushanskiy at Lenfilm, depicting the aftermath of a nuclear war. Yevtushenko begins by noting Kramer's "On the Beach" and the TV movie "The Day After" as examples of the genre of "futurology of a potential nuclear catastrophe" which go beyond the "alarmist" approach, and notes the lack, hitherto, of such a genre in the Soviet movie industry. While warning against the "deliberately 'nightmarish' view of the future," he observes that "we sometimes go to the other extreme, avoiding talking about the horrors which await us all if the threat of war becomes a devastating reality." In this context he praises the courage of Lopushanskiy personally and of the Lenfilm studios in producing the movie, which "belongs to the category of so-called 'difficult movies' and requires hard work from the viewer's mind and heart in response." He outlines the plot of the movie and praises the cast, noting in particular the "strong, positive hero," a scientist played by R. Bykov. He concludes by noting that the movie's appearance "coincided with the disaster at Chernobyl," which made "many hitherto carefree people stop and think," and calling on everyone to see the movie.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

U.S.-SOVIET CONSULTATIONS--Geneva, 25 Aug (TASS)--A second meeting of Soviet and American experts has been held here today within the framework of preliminary bilateral consultations to study the question of centers for lessening the nuclear danger. The group of Soviet experts was led by Ambassador Aleksey Obukhov of American experts--by Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, and Robert Linhard, special assistant to the President for security affairs. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 25 Aug 86 LD] 09/9738

CSO: 5200/1541

END